National Library of Canada
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services Branch
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction des acquisitions et des services bibliographiques
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

Development of a Diagnostic Assessment Instrument For English to American Sign Language Interpretation

BY

MARTHA (MARTY) M. TAYLOR

©

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Educational Psychology

Edmonton, Alberta

Fall 1993

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-88106-2

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR:	Martha (Marty) M. Taylor
TITLE OF THESIS:	Development of a Diagnostic Assessment Instrument For English to American Sign Language Interpretation
DEGREE:	Doctor of Philosophy
YEAR DEGREE GRANTED:	1993

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly, or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as hereinbefore provided neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

Martha Taylor

Main Post Office
P.O. Box 203
Edmonton, Alberta T5J 2J1

July 6, 1993

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled Development of a Diagnostic Assessment Instrument For English to American Sign Language Interpretation submitted by Martha (Marty) M. Taylor in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

M. Rodda

Dr. Michael Rodda-Supervisor

Rogers

Dr. W. Todd Rogers

Dr. Jack S. Goldberg

Linda McDonald

Dr. Linda McDonald

Susan Haske

Dr. Susan Haske

14th. June 1993

Date

To my parents, Bernie and Roland Taylor, who not only taught me to learn and to enjoy life, but who also continue to support, encourage, and love me every day of my life.

All my love,

Your Oldest Daughter

ABSTRACT

People gain varying degrees of expertise in their field of work. Criteria within identified domains must be clearly defined if we are to assess degree of expertise and identify differences between the skills of novices and experts.

This research included the identification of skills required to interpret from English to American Sign Language (ASL) through reviewing the available literature and conducting task and error analyses of actual interpretation samples. Eight Major Features of interpretation were identified. Each Major Feature contained lists of related skills with each skill followed by lists of relevant and representative errors. In addition, definitions were added to further describe each skill.

Following the initial identification of skills, a criterion-referenced diagnostic instrument was developed to assess English-to-ASL interpretations. The instrument was validated using 24 Deaf and hearing experts from across North America to conduct a panel review and two field tests. During the field tests, the experts used the instrument to assess two video taped interpretation samples. The instrument was revised after each validation stage.

The results of the research are presented as a draft diagnostic assessment instrument and a rater's instruction manual for assessing English to ASL interpretations. These documents can be used to conduct ongoing research related to assessing interpreting skills. Further development of the instrument must continue.

The findings showed that there was slightly less than 100% consistency of agreement within each rater. The overall consistency of agreement among raters on two interpretation samples was higher at the error level, with 77% and 95%, than at the skill level, with 64% and 54%, suggesting that rating the skills without rating the errors is less consistent than rating at the error level.

Implications for practice as well as suggestions for future research are discussed.

Acknowledgements

"A dissertation is not written by one person alone."

I want to thank the following people with all my heart:

Tanya Adler for her never-ending support and encouragement every single day and millisecond of these past four years and when I asked for the hundredth time, "Will I ever get this done?" would always answer with a resounding "Yes, of course!"

Sharon Neumann Solow, for teaching me how to interpret and how to educate interpreters and most of all for being my friend.

To the many editors who previewed the various stages of the research and dissertation especially Yvonne Walmsley for her clarity of thought and excellent writing skills. Also, Greta Adler, Jeni Adler Magat, Patricia Conrad, and Bernie Taylor for critiquing the initial drafts of my dissertation. And, Marilyn Hooper who located references which was of immeasurable help to me in documenting my research.

Sharon Sherman, who asked probing questions and comments when I began writing the instrument and who was wonderful at providing me with moral support. Also Patricia Conrad, Greg Evans, Karen Malcolm, Debra Russell, Sharon Sherman, and David Still for providing me with their insightful and honest feedback at various stages of developing the diagnostic instrument.

Angela Stratiy, with her excellent command of ASL, who answered my multitude of questions on a day to day basis concerning ASL and interpreting.

Leanne Walls for developing the script and audio tape used in the field studies.

To my supervisory committee who persisted in requiring me to go beyond my own expectations of myself. A special thank you to Michael Rodda who supervised my entire research and to Todd Rogers with his meticulous eye for detail and his knowledge of evaluation and measurement that made the resulting dissertation better than could have ever been imagined. And Jack Goldberg who asked intelligent and thought provoking questions.

Marina McIntire, for writing a reference letter when I first applied to attend university and for being my external evaluator, who read the dissertation with a discerning eye and developed probing questions for the final oral defense to be certain I was aware of the issues surrounding my research.

The Association of Visual Language Interpreters of Canada and the individual interpreters who gave me permission to view their certification tapes which greatly assisted me in my research endeavors.

The 24 Deaf and hearing people who participated in the pilot and field studies and to whom I will forever be grateful. As well as the 3 interpreters who allowed their interpretations to be video taped and used in the field studies. As promised they will remain anonymous in this thesis.

The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for providing me with a three year doctoral fellowship allowing me the opportunity to pursue my doctoral research full time and complete it in a reasonable length of time.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM 1
Communication 1
Interpretation 2
The Interpreting Process 3
History of Spoken Language Interpreting 5
Deafness 6
Sign Languages 6
Deaf Culture Interacting with Hearing Culture 7
Sign Language Interpreters 7
History 7
Education 8
Certification and Assessment 9
Purpose of the Research 11
Justification 11
Legislation 11
The Interpreting Profession 12
Requirement to Research Interpreter's Skills 12
Delimitations of the Study 13

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 15
Expertise 15
Knowledge-lean and Knowledge-rich Expertise 15
Differences Between Novices and Experts 16
Weaknesses In the Novice and Expert Literature 20
ASL/English Interpreting Education 21
Post-Secondary Programs 21
Curricula 22
Testing and Certification 25
ASL/English Interpreting Assessment 26
Interpreters' and Deaf People's Intuition 26
RID National Certification 26
AVLIC National Certification 27
Summary 28

CHAPTER 3: INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT AND EXPERT PANEL REVIEW 30
Overview 30
Instrument Development 31
Step 1: Determine the Purposes For Which The Assessment Scores Derived From the Instrument Would Be Used 31
Step 2: Identify and Describe the Behaviors Indicative of Good Interpretation Practice 32
Information Sources 32
Task Analysis 33
Step 3: Create the Test Specifications and the Method of Recording Observed Behaviors and Step 4: Construct the Initial Pool of Items 34
Categorizing the Skills 34
Making the Instrument Manageable 35
Sequencing the Features and Skills 37
Defining the Domain 39
Summary of Steps One to Four 40
Panel Review 41
Step 5: Review of the Instrument By a Panel of Interpretation Experts 41
Selecting the Panel 41
Hearing Experts' Qualifications 43
Deaf Experts' Qualifications 45
Meeting With the Experts 46
Specification of the Task for the Panel Members 48
Panel Review Procedures 49
Analysis of Validation Panel Data 50
Results of the Panel Review 50
Panelists' General Comments 50
Major Features Revisions 50
Sequence of Major Features Revisions 51

Skills and Errors Revisions 52
Additions to Complete the Instrument 53
Definitions 53
Rating Scale 54
Instrument 54

CHAPTER 4: FIELD TEST 1 55
Method 55
Developing the Audio Tape Stimulus 55
The Interpreters 56
Developing the Video Tape 56
Using the Instrument and Rating Performances 57
The Raters 57
Procedures for Rating Performances 58
Meeting With Raters Together 58
Assessment of the Sample Interpretations 60
Collecting Raters' Reactions to the Assessment Procedures 60
Findings 61
Time Required to Complete the Assessments 61
Raters' General Comments 61
Specific Reactions to the Instrument 62
Major Features 62
Skills and Errors 62
Definitions 63
Length of Stimulus 63
The Suggested Procedure 64
The 4-Point Rating Scale 64
Revisions 65
Major Features 65
Skills, Errors, and Definitions 65
Rating Scale 66
Additions Made to the Instrument 67
Results of the Revisions 68

Preparation of the Instruction Manual....68

CHAPTER 5: FIELD TEST 2....69
Method....69
The Audio Tape Stimulus....69
The Interpreters....69
Developing the Video Tape....70
Using the Instrument and Rating Performances....70
The Raters....70
Procedures for Rating Performances....72
Group Meeting....72
Individual Meetings....73
Collecting Raters' Reactions to the Assessment Procedures....73
Findings....74
Time Required to Complete the Assessments....74
Rating Consistency Within Raters....76
Agreement Among Raters Across Skills Within Each Major Feature....77
Interpretation 2....77
Interpretation 3....78
Agreement Among Raters Across Errors within Each Major Feature....79
Interpretation 2....80
Interpretation 3....81
Revisions....83
Skills, Errors, and Definitions....83
Rating Scale....84
The Instrument....84
The Instruction Manual....85

CHAPTER 6: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS....87
Purpose of the Study....87
Summary of Procedures....88

Step 1 to Step 4: Developing the Instrument....89
Step 5: Panel Review....90
Step 6: Field Tests....90
Limitations of the Study....92
Step 7: Findings and Conclusions....92
Implications for Practice....93
Implications for Research....94
Required Research....94
Improving the Instrument....95
Knowledge-Rich Major Features....95
Instrument's Self-Instructional Qualities....95
Time Required to Rate Interpretations....96
Increasing the Pool of Raters....96
Developing Similar Instruments....96
Effect on Interpreters Receiving Feedback From Raters....97
Key Skills of Novices and Experts....97

References....99

Appendix A Resources Used For Identifying Skills....108
Appendix B Video Tapes With Interpretation Models....117
Appendix C Panel Members Qualifications Forms....119
Appendix D Forms Used to Provide Consistency in Responses From Experts....121
Appendix E Audio Tape Transcript....125
Appendix F Instrument: Draft 4....127
Appendix G Rater's Instruction Manual: Draft 2....225

List of Tables

Table		Page
1	Partial List of Skills Related to Interpreting Numbers Accurately	36
2	Number of Original Skills Aggregated to Lesser Numbers by Major Features	37
3	The Number of Essential and Desirable Skills within Each Major Feature	39
4	Errors Related to the Momentum of Signing Numbers	40
5	Hearing Experts' Qualifications	44
6	Deaf Experts' Qualifications	46
7	Major Features Sequence Revisions as a Result of the Panel Review	51
8	Revisions of Skills and Errors within Major Features as a Result of the Panel Review	52
9	Revisions of Skills, Errors, and Definitions within Major Features as a Result of Field Test 1	66
10	Field Test 2 Rater Qualifications	71
11	Time Required to Rate Interpretation Samples 2 and 3 across Seven Raters	75

12 Agreement Among Raters for Interpretation 2 across Skills within Each Major Feature 78

13 Agreement Among Raters for Interpretation 3 across Skills within Each Major Feature 79

14 Rater Agreement on Interpretation 2 across Errors at the Aggregated Rating Level within Each Major Feature 81

15 Rater Agreement on Interpretation 3 across Errors at the Aggregated Rating Level within Each Major Feature 82

16 Revisions of Skills, Errors, and Definitions following Field Test 2 83

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

Communication

Communication is essential to human existence. In its broadest and most common use it can be verbal or nonverbal. Verbal communication is characterized by the expression of thoughts through words in an oral-aural modality (Hayakawa, 1978). These verbal communications are conveyed using a variety of techniques such as manipulation of intonation, enunciation, pronunciation, and voice quality in speech. In contrast, characteristics and behaviors exhibited through posture, eye contact, facial expression, and nuances of the body and face constitute nonverbal communication.

Communication is needed in order to relay information from one person to another person or from one group of people to another group of people. Communication is a strategy by which people exchange ideas and opinions. It is a method through which one can express feelings and thoughts both to oneself and to others.

Humans need to communicate in order to function in the society in which they live. In many countries around the world, communication skills are necessary to be effective employees and effective employers. Often job announcements specify that effective communication skills are essential for certain positions. In education a person must communicate ideas via spoken and written forms in order to advance successfully from one grade or academic level to the next.

Without communication people are isolated and not able to understand what's happening around them. Consequently, people lacking communication skills may be behind their peers in social interaction and educational achievements. In many societies, a person with poor communication skills may be disempowered; empowerment will belong with those who communicate well.

Communication can take place using other methods or systems, for example, Morse Code and the use of flags. However, language is

one of the most common forms of communication. The commonly held definition of a language is that it is aural-oral, heard and spoken, and is represented by a symbol system of sounds used to symbolize meaning in the world and meaning to each other (Hayakawa, 1978).

According to Stokoe (1973), a linguist, this definition fails to include visual-manual languages, that is, sign languages. It has been well documented over the past 15 years that sign languages are indeed bona fide languages (e.g., Baker & Cokely, 1980; Klima & Bellugi, 1979; Woodward, 1978). Like any language, sign language has its own lexicon, syntactic structure, and grammar to convey meaning. It is based on a visual-manual mode of communication and is used primarily by culturally Deaf individuals, that is, those who are raised in an environment exposed to sign language through Deaf adults who pass on their language and their culture from generation to generation (Padden, 1980).

There are many different sign languages (Frishberg, 1990), for example, American Sign Language, British Sign Language, Japanese Sign Language, and German Sign Language. The notion that sign language is a universal language is a myth. People who use sign language to communicate use different languages. Usually these people are either Deaf or friends or relatives of Deaf persons who through necessity and/or opportunity have acquired the sign language used in their Deaf community.

Before discussing communication between hearing and Deaf individuals, the issue of bridging the gap between people who do not share the same language will be briefly examined, that is, interpretation.

Interpretation

The term interpretation has several different meanings. Interpretation can mean interpreting music, a theatrical performance, someone's nonverbal communication, and even

environmental interpreting in a park. Such interpretation is from an affective, abstract, and subjective viewpoint, and is different from interpretation for the purpose of communication among people.

Within the interpreting profession, the term interpretation is also distinct from the term 'translation'. There are many different types of translation. The most common type refers to the written text of one language being translated into a written text of another language. The key element is that translation is written and not spoken (Seleskovitch, 1978). In contrast, interpretation is spoken. It is the facilitation of communication between two or more people who do not share the same language.

The Interpreting Process

Consecutive and simultaneous interpreting are two commonly used methods of interpretation. Consecutive interpretation refers to the process of listening to the speaker and waiting until a few sentences, a paragraph, or an entire speech is rendered. Then, either by memory if the passage was short, or by using notes if the passage was long or technical, the interpreter relays the information into the second language.

Simultaneous interpretation, the type of interpreting most often used in the United Nations (Frishberg, 1990) and other meetings of this caliber, is the process by which interpreters are only seconds behind the original speaker in their interpretation of the message into a second language.

The process of interpretation is complex. It entails the ability to move from one language to another language with ease, comfort, and accuracy. Interpreters must listen to the incoming message in the source language, process this message, and then articulate it into an equivalent message in the target language while often simultaneously listening to further incoming messages. Interpreters must have the ability to successfully accomplish multi-task mental processing.

In addition to the mental processing of one language into another, the interpreter must be able to quickly and smoothly interpret from the source language into the target language and back again when the conversation is not one way in direction but back and forth. When transmitting the information from one party to another, interpreters are also required to do it as faithfully as possible and in a manner which reflects the mood, affect, and nuances of all parties involved.

When one discusses interpretation of language for purposes of communication, it is not simply the transmission of vocabulary or sentences or even concepts; it also includes conveying the cultural nuances associated with both languages. Language actually shapes people's perception and thinking, thus affecting their actions (Condon & Yousef, 1984). People belonging to a particular culture use their own language when talking to people from their cultural community. "A culture is a set of learned behaviors of a group of people who have their own language, values, rules for behavior, and traditions" (Padden, 1980, p. 92). Cultural information must be conveyed and cultural adjustments appropriately used in the interpretation process. An interpreter in effect is a mediator of both language and culture. Interpreters are not only bilingual but also bicultural. Because language and culture are so closely tied (in fact at times impossible to separate), often an interpreter must include both in the interpretation process. The interpreter who is enculturated in both language communities can make these adjustments and focus on the mental processes necessary to render a competent interpretation.

An interpretation, like a translation, is not a word for word, or a concept for concept articulation of a message. It is an entire process with the goal of equating, as much as is possible, a message from one person's language into the language of another person, so that the person receiving the interpretation is affected as if the message was heard in its original language.

History of Spoken Language Interpreting

Whenever people from two different language groups come together in order to communicate, they must negotiate using either a common language or a common system by which they can make themselves understood. When people do not share the same language, one way of negotiating this communication barrier is to employ the services of an interpreter who is fluent in both languages.

After World War I, representatives of nations had a dire need to communicate with each other on an international and political level. There was a need for qualified interpreters who could interpret at a sophisticated level and handle the nuances that prevail in politics. As well, interpreters needed to be adept at more than one language in order to carry on international business. Professional spoken language interpreters emerged as a result of international meetings and the need for shared communication among representatives from different nations (Frishberg, 1990).

Prior to this time there were always people who acted in an informal capacity conveying messages between parties who wished to express themselves but lacked the ability to use the other's language (Seleskovitch, 1978). For example, minority language groups within a dominant culture who wanted to speak with people of the majority language group (or vice versa) needed to have an 'interpreter' to convey messages. These situations encompassed everything from banking needs and filling out employment application forms to making funeral arrangements for deceased family members. Often the individuals who performed this 'interpreting' task were children or other family members who spoke the language of the minority language group and who had an opportunity to acquire the language of the majority language group. They acted as the 'go-between' or the 'interpreter' in situations where it was needed.

Deafness

Many hard of hearing people, having only a mild to moderate hearing loss, function within their community using the sense of hearing. These individuals include those who were born with a hearing loss and those who lost some of their hearing later in life, after acquiring speech. On the other hand, there are those individuals who were either born deaf or were deafened at a very young age prior to learning a spoken language. Many of the latter are educated in residential schools and socialize within the Deaf community, thereby learning sign language as their primary mode of communication, instead of a spoken language which depends on the sense of hearing (Padden & Humphries, 1988).

Sign Languages

In Canada and the United States at least two sign languages are prevalently used: la Langue des Signes Québécoise (LSQ) and American Sign Language (ASL). In the province of Quebec and other nearby French speaking communities, Deaf people use LSQ, which is distinct from ASL, just as spoken French is distinct from spoken English.

In North America, ASL is used with only slight variations among different regions. Regional differences exist in lexicon, speed, and signing style much like that of spoken English (Sternberg, 1981). For example, there are a number of ASL regional lexical differences to express the meanings for 'birthday' and 'early'. Also, signing speed can vary regionally much like the speed with which people speaking English vary from the east to the west coast of the United States.

Deaf Culture Interacting with Hearing Culture

Deaf people have their own distinct culture with their own sign languages, values, social norms, rules for behavior, and traditions. This culture is different from the mainstream culture in which they live. Thus, the word 'Deaf' is capitalized to indicate a cultural group of people. In contrast 'deaf' is used when referring to people who have a loss of hearing but are not a part of a Deaf cultural group.

For the Deaf community, this culture is learned by the minority living within the majority hearing group. Many Deaf people are bicultural, meaning they have acquired the knowledge and skills to move with differing degrees of ease between and among hearing and Deaf cultures. Deaf people may attend hearing functions. They may attend colleges and universities with hearing people. Their colleagues at work may be hearing. The majority culture in which they live is hearing.

One major difference exists between Deaf people as a minority group and other minority groups. Deaf people do not have a sense of hearing. Therefore, they can not learn naturally the spoken language used in their society. There are rare instances where a Deaf person has an exceptional talent to speechread and/or speak, but even this is learned artificially and not naturally as a spoken language is learned.

Sign Language Interpreters

History

Sign Language interpretation began when hearing people started working with Deaf individuals within their own family unit (Pimentel, 1979). Initially, friends and family members tended to act as 'interpreters', or more accurately 'helpers', when the Deaf person needed to communicate with hearing people to share

information. Often hearing children were used as 'helpers' to bridge the gap between their Deaf parents and the hearing world at large (Frishberg, 1990). This important role of 'helper' also became popular in the religious sector where religious workers learned sign language to educate and introduce Deaf people to religion (Frishberg, 1990).

In the United States, the profession of ASL/English interpreting was acknowledged in 1964 through a series of conferences (Frishberg, 1986). North American national associations of ASL/English interpreters began in the 1960's and 1970's. In the United States, the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID) was founded in 1964 and incorporated in 1972. In Canada, the Association of Visual Language Interpreters of Canada (AVLIC) was founded in 1971 and incorporated in 1981.

In the United States, as a result of the Rehabilitation Acts of 1965 and 1973, which required funds to be used to provide interpreting services for vocational rehabilitation clients and mandated equal access for disabled people to federally sponsored programs such as employment, education and health, there was an increase in the demand for sign language interpreters (Frishberg, 1990).

Today, interpreters are needed for a multitude of daily situations for both Deaf and hearing people, such as: the Deaf lawyer and a hearing judge; the Deaf printer and his employer; the Deaf parents of an ill child in a hospital; the Deaf couple going before a rabbi or minister for the exchange of their marriage vows; the mainstreamed Deaf student, hearing teachers, and classmates; and the Deaf person who wants to take a CPR course offered at the local community center.

Education

In the early 1960's, it was recognized that there was a shortage of competent interpreters (Fant, 1990). It became

imperative, as a result of the Rehabilitation Acts of 1965 and 1973, that the United States train skilled interpreters to facilitate communication effectively between Deaf and hearing people so as to provide Deaf people access to federally sponsored programs as mandated by federal law.

Early in the 1970's formal education of interpreters began in the United States (Neumann Solow, 1981), while in Canada, the first ASL/English interpreter training program was established in 1982 (Schein, Carver, & Mallory, 1989). Prior to this time, there were sign language programs offering courses in sign language, which then graduated students who worked in the interpreting field. However, a program containing extensive work in interpreting was not achieved in Canada until 1982 (Schein et al., 1989).

Certification and Assessment

As a result of professional training, more interpreters began entering the work force. Once they were in the work force, employers, both Deaf and hearing, identified a need for assessment to determine the competency level of interpreters.

In 1964, at the founding of RID, there was agreement that an organization was needed to assess interpreters' competencies (Fant, 1990). Eight years later RID began certifying interpreters (Fant, 1990). The Canadian national association of interpreters, AVLIC, implemented its first certifying exam in August, 1990 (Evans, 1991). At the present time both of these certifying examinations are normative-based and do not provide diagnostic feedback to the interpreters taking the examinations.

Per-Lee (1981) stated there is an identified need to develop a profile of relevant characteristics of sign language interpreters.

> Deaf people have intuitively recognized that interpreters vary greatly in their skills. There is no scientific body of knowledge, however, defining the characteristics of those

> factors that make a good interpreter. There is, at this time, a unique need of 8,000 interpreters and an increased projection for the next five years. Therefore, research is needed to identify those characteristics which can be transferred into professional development programs and certification standards for successful interpreters. (p. 14)

Cokely (1986) investigated different interpretation models that primarily were concerned with the cognitive processes involved in the interpretation process. The source language message was a key element in the development and analysis of the various models. He found in his research that interpreters must understand the message they are interpreting or else they will fail to interpret it accurately.

Specifically, Cokely conducted research on the relationship of the amount of lag time interpreters have between the utterance of the source language and the rendering of the interpreted message. Interpeters were video taped while interpreting for a live spoken English expository monologue. Through a sampling procedure of one minute out of every five minutes, a total of approximately 8 minutes of video tape was used. The English and the ASL was transcribed as well as the elapsed time, down to the tenth of a second.

He was particularly interested in the interpreters' processing time and the relationship between the length of the mental processing time used and the number of errors in the interpreted message. He analyzed the errors and miscues interpreters made. Deviations from the original message were considered miscues. In all, five major categories of miscues were identified: omissions, additions, substitutions, intrusions, and anomalies. His research indicated that the less the lag the higher the occurrence of miscues.

Purpose of the Research

Deaf people have the right to access the hearing community in which they live. One essential way of providing this access is through the provision of competent Sign Language interpreters. As Per-Lee (1981) stated, there is a need to research the characteristics of competent interpreters. Therefore, the purpose of this research was first to identify the skills demonstrated in interpretations from the source language of spoken English to the target language of American Sign Language (ASL). Second, the purpose was to develop a valid and reliable criterion-referenced instrument for assessing interpreters with different levels of skills when interpreting from English to ASL. The instrument could then be used for diagnostic purposes by providing interpreters with an assessment of their strengths and weaknesses.

Justification

Legislation

Only by providing Deaf people with access to the hearing community will they have the opportunity to achieve success equal to that of the hearing community.

As discussed in the previous sections, law requires that Deaf people have access to the services within the hearing community. Federal legislation in the United States and Canada concerning people with disabilities is prevalent. In addition to the Rehabilitation Acts of 1965 and 1973, several other laws and activities have been mandated. For example, the United States passed the Americans With Disabilities Act ("Senate passed bill," 1989). The Canadian federal government proclaimed 1983-1992 the Decade of Disabled Persons and established the National Strategy for the Integration of Persons with Disabilities as recently as 1991.

Accessibility for disabled people is an important current issue in North America.

The Interpreting Profession

Professional interpreting organizations and interpreting programs have an obligation to ensure that their members and their graduates are competent. The critical aspect of competence is that an individual must be able to perform the required tasks at an acceptable standard.

In February, 1991, a national meeting sponsored by the Disabled Persons Participation Program was held in Ottawa on the training of sign language interpreters with representation from national Deaf, hard of hearing and deaf-blind organizations, in addition to AVLIC. At this meeting, the Canadian Association for the Education of Sign Language Interpreters (the Canadian organization of interpreter educators) and the Canadian Association of the Deaf were in agreement with employers of interpreters that there is a significant gap between the skill level of interpreting program graduates and the level required to function effectively within the varied settings confronting interpreters.

In 1990, the pass rate for the performance segment of AVLIC's certification exam was 21%. This low pass rate illustrates the lack of skilled interpreters in Canada. What skills are they lacking? How can they improve? A process for identifying the interpretation skills possessed by interpreters and comparing these to those skills required to perform competently is clearly needed.

Requirement to Research Interpreter's Skills

The need to empirically investigate the field of interpretation is necessary to advance the interpreting profession and to provide hearing and Deaf consumers with competent ASL/English interpreters.

The profession must investigate the elements of the interpretation process. Specifically what elements are characterized by what behaviors? For example, to what degree is the source language, spoken English, equivalent to the interpretation in the target language, ASL? How can a better interpretation be provided? What are the strengths and weaknesses in an interpretation?

Research on the identification of requisite skills needed in an interpretation will enhance interpreter programs by guiding the development of curricula and materials to match the identified skills. This type of research can also assist interpreters who are preparing to take certifying examinations and are interested in determining their strengths and weaknesses prior to taking the examinations.

Through research on the skills required to provide a competent interpretation and the development of a diagnostic instrument to assess interpreters, with the ultimate goal of improving their competency level, Deaf people will be assured quality access to all aspects of their daily lives.

Delimitations of the Study

The goal of this study was to identify skills and develop an assessment instrument for interpreting from spoken English to ASL. It did not address interpreting ASL to English. Nor did it address interpreting other sign languages or signing systems that represent English such as Signing Exact English or Pidgin Signed English.

Although many of the identified skills were skills related to ASL, the assessment instrument was designed to analyze these skills only in the context of an interpretation. That is, the instrument was not designed to assess ASL signing skills, but rather English-to-ASL interpreting skills.

This research addressed the issue of competence in terms of ability to do, not in terms of knowledge. Therefore, the question

was not what one knows about the languages used or the topic being interpreted, but rather what interpreters do with this information in their performance.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Expertise

Expertise is the ability to demonstrate conceptual and procedural knowledge through rapidly accessing mental functions. Over the past 25 years, researchers have been unraveling the nature of expertise (e.g., Duda, 1981; Engle & Bukstel, 1978; Patel, Frederiksen, & Groen, 1984). In a multitude of fields, scholars have been conducting research to determine the answer to the question: "What is expertise and how is it exhibited?" (e.g., Carter, Cushing, Sabers, Stein, & Berliner, 1988; Perfetti & Lesgold, 1979; Sloboda, 1978). To date, the most common way of studying expertise has been to compare and contrast the performance of experts and novices using the format as a so-called 'gold standard' (e.g., Benner, 1984).

Knowledge-lean and Knowledge-rich Expertise

The early studies of expertise were conducted during the 1960's and early 1970's. Experimental psychologists conducted research in the area of information processing, more specifically problem solving strategies (e.g., Brown, 1978; Chase & Simon, 1973a, 1973b; Newell & Simon, 1972). The majority of these experiments were in the area of 'knowledge-lean' tasks, that is, tasks which could be learned in a very short period of time resulting in competency (Glaser, 1987, p. 81). These studies showed that general cognitive processes were the same across individuals. Thus, each person could achieve competency or expertise using general knowledge processes. No special learning was required.

Often these studies used an approach which defined the baseline performance, indicating a person's ability or skill to perform a specific task under study prior to any experience. This baseline was then compared to the outcome of the experiment in

terms of competency achieved. Often this was a one-time measurement and was done under standardized conditions, including the instructions dealing with the tasks involved and the manner in which to respond.

The studies were enlightening; however, the research did not address learning and thinking which occur over an extensive period of time and with a great deal of experience. These studies lacked research into the deep structure of domain-specific knowledge, that is 'knowledge-rich' tasks, tasks that require an abundance of learning over time with significant amounts of experiences related to a particular area (Glaser, 1987, p. 82).

In recent years, researchers such as Anderson (1981, 1982), Baltes, Dittmann-Kohli, and Dixon (1984), and Chi, Glaser, and Farr (1988) have focused much more on studies of expertise, particularly in the area of knowledge-rich tasks. Experts such as master chess players, nurses, teachers, and radiologists have learned their skills over a much more extended period of time than the knowledge-lean skills studied in the 1960's and 1970's. Even novices within each of these areas have spent more time in learning than the prior experimental studies in experimental psychology (Glaser, 1987).

Models of adult cognition and intellectual development have tried to deal with the interrelatedness of experiences and cognitive processes as it relates to specified knowledge areas (Baltes et al., 1984; Baltes & Kliegl, 1986; Charness, 1981; Denney, 1984; Hoyer, 1985; Labouvie-Vief, 1982, 1985; Salthouse, 1985). More specifically, cognitive theories have tried to examine this issue in relation to differences between experts and novices (Brown, 1982; Chi, Glaser, & Rees, 1982). Thus, levels of expertise were studied.

Differences Between Novices and Experts

Every occupation, such as chess players (Chase & Simon, 1973a; de Groot, 1965; Patel et al., 1984), bridge players (Engle & Bukstel, 1978), teachers (Carter & Berliner, 1987), and nurses

(Benner, 1984) have individuals who range in skill and knowledge from novices to experts. There are five levels of skills cited in the literature. These are novice, advanced beginning, competence, proficiency, and expertise (Dreyfus, Dreyfus, & Athanasiou, 1986). Each level is more advanced than the previous level.

The novice is characterized as having literal knowledge about objects and events. The depth of representational knowledge is limited (Anderson, 1981; Calderhead, 1983). In contrast, the expert has developed the ability to use abstraction and make inferences about principles involved in the situation.

Chi, Feltovich, and Glaser (1981) studied problems in mechanics. They found novices classify problems according to the physical properties of situations such as the valve problem or strut problem. Experts have the ability to categorize at a more complex schematic level by applying principles of physics to the specific problem noted and the impact of this principle on the outcome of the solution.

Novices, according to Dreyfus et al. (1986) and others (e.g., Benner, 1984), have the ability to recognize objective facts relatively easily but lack contextualism when dealing with various situations and therefore rely on rote answers. Novices are followers of rules and it is these rules which govern their actions.

Dreyfus et al. (1986) and Benner (1984) go on to say that as novices progress to a higher level of skill they develop experience in dealing with real situations. Advanced beginners have the ability to contextualize the situation more broadly than novices. Advanced beginners see the situation more as a whole, rather than just unrelated and isolated parts.

These same researchers consider the skill level of competence to be half-way between novice and expertise. Competence is characterized by the ability to view the situation as a set of facts rather than as individual components that make up the situation. The person who is competent also has the ability to rule out the unimportant factors and deal with only the salient features of the

situation. The competent person is not looking at it from the outside but is engrossed in the inner workings of the situation.

Proficient individuals not only see the situation as a whole, but also rely on experience to make decisions about the best course of action to take in a given situation. Their experience permits them to reflect on the long term implications of the array of possible decisions that exists.

The highest level of skill, that of expertise, is characterized by rapid, fluid, and involved behavior that is quite different from the slow, uninvolved mental processes used in the problem solving process seen at the earlier stages of skill development (Dreyfus et al., 1986). Thought is not given to how something should be done, but attention is given to the intuitive decisions that come rapidly and successively while the person is involved in the situation. A gestalt viewpoint is used while features related to the situation or task come to the foreground and other, more irrelevant information fades to the background. Practice provides experience, a key element in addition to actually developing the skill.

Experts are better able to remember specific meaningful information such as facts and patterns in a specific area of expertise. In 1965, de Groot demonstrated this among chess players. His research was later replicated in several studies of chess players, for example Chase and Simon (1973b) and Patel, Frederiksen, and Groen (1984).

Similarly, Larkin, McDermott, Simon, and Simon (1980) found that the most striking difference between expert and novice performance in solving physics problems is that "the expert knows a great many things the novice does not know and can rapidly evoke the particular items relevant to the problem at hand" (p. 1136). Engle and Bukstel (1978) concluded their study by stating, "bridge players with 'supranormal' memory are able to use their prior experience to configure and chunk information in more efficient ways than players of less expertise" (p. 673). The ability to perceive information in chunks in order to determine meaning, which

is often said to be nearing 'intuition', is essential to the functioning of experts (Chi et al., 1982; Lesgold, 1984).

Experts use the ability to monitor their own behavior and constantly adjust to fit the demands of the situation because they have developed automaticity in performing the "basic operations" of the task. In this way their working memory is available for higher level conscious processing (Perfetti & Lesgold, 1979). More specifically, a key feature of behavior exhibited by experts is the ability to use self-regulating processes as a result of experience (Brown, 1978; Gitomer & Glaser, 1985). These cognitive skills are manifested by proficiency in techniques of solution monitoring, by the allocation of attention, and by sensitivity to informational feedback.

In the field of interpretation, interpreters must determine the best interpretation based on the contextual cues of the situation. For example, a specific English phrase is spoken but the meaning is ambiguous; "As you pass out please hand in your papers." Does the phrase pass out mean to faint? Is the instructor being sarcastic or humorous? Does the instructor simply mean, as you leave, please hand in your papers? The interpreter must make a decision within seconds of the utterance. Based on the interpreter's experience and the familiarity with the speaker and the setting, the interpreter will make a decision. Whether it is the right one depends on the interpreter's expertise to evaluate the setting and the utterance, using all of the available cues. In ASL/English interpreting this is demonstrated when the Deaf consumer shows a quizzical expression indicating a lack of comprehension. Within seconds, the interpreter will evaluate the problem. The interpreter may identify immediately that the interpreted message contained an incorrect sign or the interpreter neglected to add a negation, thereby mistakenly making the statement affirmative, which did not make sense to the Deaf person. After determining what interpretation error occurred, the interpreter will make the necessary adjustment to rectify the error. In this example, the interpreter is exhibiting

the ability to respond to informational feedback by monitoring the solution and mentally replaying a portion of the confusing interpretation. At the same time the interpreter must maintain concentration not only to correct the error, but also to continue attending to and interpreting the speaker's ongoing message.

Weaknesses In the Novice and Expert Literature

The research related to expertise has several limitations. One of the most obvious issues is the limited number of experts in the specific domain being studied (Kliegl & Baltes, 1987). Thus, the pool of possible research subjects is restricted. The number of participants in a study tends to be small (e.g., Carter, Sabers, Cushing, Pinnegar, & Berlinger, 1987). In Chi, Glaser, and Rees' (1982) study comparing expert and novice performance in solving problems in elementary physics, the researchers used only one expert and one novice. Generalizability of the findings becomes an obvious issue.

The issue is further confounded when peers evaluate the few qualified experts. Similar difficulties arise when the selection procedures are primarily based on the opinions and observations of co-workers and superiors (e.g., Gitomer & Glaser, 1985; Hoyer, 1985; Labouvie-Vief, 1985; Lesgold, McDermott, Simon, & Simon, 1980). The experts are often the perceived experts. The perceived experts then become the raters and evaluators. Thus, everything is in relation to them. The characteristics identified are supposedly those of experts. However, do these experts have other characteristics in addition to the expertise itself which encouraged people to support them as experts? For example, would experts be acknowledged as experts if they had poor interpersonal skills?

Acquisition of knowledge-rich expertise requires many years of practice in the relevant activity. Research on the natural development of expertise over time is severely limited. Thus, questions to be answered are: How is the level of expertise

decided? What competencies or skills must people possess to be classified as experts? How does one move from the novice to the expert level?

In many instances, issues arise such as the amount of time required to master a skill. If one wants to be an expert playing the guitar in a matter of months, this is not possible. How is this handled? Must one go through all the levels before becoming an expert? How much time does it take? Is there an average amount of time or does it depend on the individuals involved or the specific skills being learned?

The role of experience or, perhaps, more accurately the role of reflected-on experience in the development of expertise is acknowledged, but is not yet well understood. Comparative studies of skills and knowledge at various levels of experience and expertise will provide greater understanding.

ASL/English Interpreting Education

Post-Secondary Programs

As stated above, formal education of ASL/English interpreters began in the 1970's in the United States (Neumann Solow, 1981). In Canada, comprehensive education in interpreting did not begin until the 1980's (Schein et al., 1989). The profession of ASL/English interpreting is relatively new in North America. Therefore, research related to the expertise of ASL/English interpreters is relatively undeveloped.

One of the most recent Canadian reports on interpreting, as well as other related issues, was conducted in Ontario. This provincial review states that due to the "open door" policies of interpreting programs in Ontario, graduates are not prepared to enter the interpreting profession upon graduation (Ministry of Colleges and Universities, 1992).

At the federal level in Canada, the Disabled Persons Participation Program (DPPP), through meetings with representatives from a range of stakeholders, including interpreter educators, program administrators of post-secondary interpreting programs, and deaf consumers, stated that many graduates of Canadian interpreting programs were unable to adequately function as interpreters because of a lack of skill upon graduation.

Because of the infancy of formal education in ASL/English interpreting, it is not surprising that the criteria for graduating from these programs is not sufficient for graduates to work competently as interpreters.

Curricula

According to interpreter educators such as Arjona (1984), curricula used in interpreter programs, both spoken and signed, across North America are based on the experiences, opinions, and philosophies of the instructors and the college and university departments.

McKee (1980) stated that much of the literature on curricula related to the teaching of interpreters is directly related to the common settings in which interpreters work. This is still prevalent in some of the most recent curricula available in North America. For example, the University of New Brunswick Sign Language Interpreter Training Curriculum (Cokely, 1988) includes specific settings, such as educational and medical, as well as the number of individuals involved in the setting requiring an interpreter. The curriculum covers whether the interpreter will interpret for two people or a large group of people interacting. Undoubtedly, these are necessary components of interpreting but the primary question remains; what underlying skills and behaviors are necessary to interpret in these settings?

Another area included in texts used in interpreting programs (e.g., Frishberg, 1986) and, more specifically, in curricula (e.g.,

University of New Brunswick Curriculum) is information on how to work with Deaf consumers, such as Deaf-blind, oral, or individuals with minimal language skills. Indeed, this is an integral part of the curriculum and of interpreters' experience, but first interpreters must be able to interpret well before they can competently work with various consumers. It does not matter how well interpreters handle the settings or the consumers in the settings if they do not have the skills to handle the interpretation task.

Interpreters must acquire a solid foundation of interpreting skills before they can be educated to work in specific settings and with specific consumers. Without attention to the underlying skills, interpreters may never acquire the level of expertise necessary to interpret well. They may acquire skills for working in specific settings and with specific consumers, but this does not necessarily mean interpreters will possess the interpreting skills required to render a competent interpretation.

Since the 1988 University of New Brunswick curriculum, a more recent four volume curriculum, developed from 1987-1990 and titled Interpreter Training Course Curriculum Guides (Taff-Watson & Northup, 1987-1990) at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock, has been published. Even though the title of this curriculum indicates it is for interpreter training, its primary focus is not on acquiring skills and knowledge related to interpreting, but instead on acquiring skills and knowledge related to ASL and working with various consumers.

Volume I (1987) contains five course curriculum guides. The focus is primarily ASL language development and methods for communicating with deaf people. For example, Manually Coded English and speechreading, as well as working with specific consumers who are oral deaf people, not signers, are covered. No courses in Volume 1 cover ASL/English interpreting.

Volume 2 (1988) also includes five course curriculum guides. Three courses include ASL, fingerspelling, and signing Manually Coded English. The remaining two courses are dedicated to

ASL/English interpreting, one related to theory and the other related to interpreting skill development. Thus, only two out of the five curriculum guides focus on interpreting.

The curriculum designed to develop interpreting skills includes a student evaluation form that has a list of criteria for rating interpreting students on a 5-point scale. Under the portion 'Interpreting Factors: English to ASL', 10 factors are given. For example, 'sign utilization', 'message conveyed', fluency', and 'use of space' are listed. Definitions are not provided with this listing. Thus, as Arjona (1984) mentioned, the understanding of the interpreting factors and the rating is based on individual instructors' experience and knowledge.

Volume 3 (1989) contains curriculum guides for interpreting for people who are deaf-blind and curriculum on conceptual sign language. In addition, it addresses voice production for interpreters and ASL-to-English interpreting. The latter two curricula specifically address interpreting skills. The skills related to speaking clearly are covered in depth in the voice production curriculum. These skills are required to render a clearly articulated message in English regardless of the consumers or the settings. In addition, much of the content of the ASL-to-English curriculum is appropriately related to voice production. Detailed sample checklists are provided and in which speech qualities such as 'inhalation is silent, quick and unobtrusive' and the speech is 'clear, distinct and accurate' are listed. Pre-interpreting activities for interpreting from ASL to English such as abstracting and paraphrasing are also described. Very little is devoted to the actual skills of <u>interpreting</u> ASL to English, that is, comprehending ASL and rendering it into its equivalent English meaning.

Five workshop guides, not courses, are included in the final volume, Volume 4 (1990). One workshop is devoted to interpreting for persons with minimal language skills which includes specialized interpreting skills required to work with certain consumers. Two workshops cover interpreting in specific settings: interpreting in

business and industry and in mental health. The remaining two chapters are 'Visualization and Imagery for Interpreters', and 'Teaching Children Who are Deaf to Use Interpreters'. The former workshop includes developing the mental skills necessary for interpreting, but the latter again specifically addresses settings and consumers.

Testing and Certification

Experts are commonly defined as persons whose performance on a criterion task is far superior to that of normal persons (e.g., Chi et al., 1982; Emmer, Evertson, & Anderson, 1980; Evertson & Emmer, 1982). Qualitative measures differentiate novices and experts with the experts' performance being 'better', thereby outperforming the novices (e.g., Carter et al., 1987). What does 'better' mean? Are the measurements used adequate to determine the superior performance identified?

What are other ways of determining levels of skills and competencies? One way of assessing skills is through examination. Once people have completed the necessary requirements, such as education and/or experience, then often they must take certification examinations at provincial, state, and/or national levels.

In the early 1900's, only a handful of certified or licensed occupations and professions existed in the United States, compared to the early 1980's when there were about 800 (Shimburg, 1985). Public, government, and professional organizations have recognized the importance of competency and have demanded services be provided by professionals who have achieved recognized and independently assessed levels of competency.

According to Berk (1986) examinations used for the certification of various professions and occupations are set by members of that particular profession or occupation. This is also true in the area of certifying ASL/English interpreters. Both AVLIC

and RID use experts to make judgements as to the competency of interpreters.

Loveland (1976) stated that the determination of what constitutes competence is the most critical factor in test development. Any profession must begin with the identification of the necessary skills that comprise the performance domain.

ASL/English Interpreting Assessment

Interpreters' and Deaf People's Intuition

Interpreters and Deaf people based on their experiences and exposure to various competency levels of interpreters, often have an intuitive impression about who are good interpreters and who are poor interpreters. The question then becomes how is this known? What are the criteria for this intuitive viewpoint?

Experienced interpreters' and Deaf consumers' intuitive reactions toward an interpretation do have merit (Per-Lee, 1981), but what is this merit? How can interpreters' skill level be improved? Most important of all, what is considered competent and how is this measured? What criteria are used when determining competency?

RID National Certification

In the United States, the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID) first offered national evaluations for certification of English/ASL interpreters in 1972 (Frishberg, 1990). Interpreters who were successful on the entire evaluation were granted the Comprehensive Skills Certificate (CSC).

The CSC evaluation was weighted based on skills and the importance of those skills. When assessing English-to-ASL interpretations, the skills evaluated were stated in general terms, for example, 'non-manual behaviors', 'use of space', 'speed/time lag',

and 'message conveyed'. A total of 10 factors were assessed on a 5-point rating scale (e.g., from inappropriate to appropriate or skewed to accurate). A panel of Deaf and hearing raters independently rated the live performances.

About 10 years after the evaluation of interpreters began, Culton (1981) examined the validity and reliability of the CSC. He stated, "the results of this study cast doubts on the reliability of scoring methods on the Comprehensive Skills Certificate evaluation, as the scoring patterns of various evaluating panels appeared to differ significantly. The California evaluation panels used for this study produced scoring patterns at variance with the general scoring patterns of over fifty panels throughout North America in four out of five sections of the evaluation studied" (p. 52).

More recently, in 1987, the evaluation system was changed from a criterion-referenced to a proficiency-based system, again using trained expert raters (Fant, 1990). Certified members, holding a CSC, viewed video tapes at the RID 1987 biennial conference held in St. Paul, Minnesota, and determined the cut off scores for passing. The performance domain was determined to include not only interpreting, but also languages, that is, English and ASL.
The impact on interpreters taking the test is that when they receive their results they are informed of their pass or fail mark. If the interpreters pass, they are told only that they passed. Nothing is mentioned as to how well they did or areas they may need to improve. It is not diagnostic. If they fail, no indication is made as to what portions they failed or how far they fell short of the minimum criteria.

AVLIC National Certification

The Association of Visual Language Interpreters of Canada (AVLIC) began certifying interpreters in 1990 (Janzen & Demers, 1990). Similar to the revised RID certificate, the Test of Interpretation (TOI) is a proficiency-based performance test.

Experts determined the minimum scores for passing. The performance domain, like the RID's, was determined to include competency in not only the message equivalency of the interpretation, but also English and ASL.

Successful interpreters must perform at an acceptable level at each domain to be granted certification. The raters received training and were said to be consistent with each other in their decisions (Evans, 1991).

Again the questions remain: What skills do expert interpreters demonstrate? If interpreters fail, what do they need to achieve before they are able to pass? What skills do they already possess?

Summary

Deaf and hearing consumers and employers of interpreters are in agreement that many graduates of ASL/English interpreting programs lack the necessary skills to interpret competently upon graduation. This is confirmed by the fact that interpreters who took the AVLIC performance exam in 1990 had a failure rate of 79%. According to the RID Views (November, 1992), data related to the number of interpreters who passed or failed the performance examinations were not kept for the fiscal years 1988-1989 and 1989-1990. However, interpreters who took the RID performance exam, for ASL/English interpretation in fiscal year 1990-1991 and received their results, had a failure rate of approximately 54%. Interpreters who took the exam in 1991-1992, and received their results, had a failure rate of approximately 27%.

A proficiency-based evaluation indicating a pass or fail has its purpose. The goal of certification is competency and not diagnostic. However, to provide the test taker with only a pass or fail mark does not provide information as to what the level of competency was and what it was not. What were the strengths and weaknesses? What should be done to improve? Even with passing marks of 'competent', interpreters may still have areas of weaknesses. Granted, this is

not the purpose of many certification examinations. However, these areas of weakness could be addressed if interpreters were given the necessary information.

One method of providing information to interpreters is to provide diagnostic assessments of their interpretations. With the results of these assessments, interpreters can use the information to progress to a higher level of expertise.

If this is to occur, first specific skills must be identified and then, a method for assessing the skills must be developed. Following these two steps, curricula must be developed that not only list requisite skills of expert interpreters, but defines them so that instructors and the departments of colleges and universities have more to rely on than simply their own expertise. Although expertise is helpful, experts have varying degrees of expertise and may have different philosophies and opinions. Hence, the skills of expert interpreters must be more objectively determined and defined. With this in place, curricula can be enhanced, thus enhancing interpreting programs and graduates' skill level upon graduation.

Further research is needed in the areas of novice and expert levels of competency. All disciplines without exception can benefit from this type of research. How can people improve? How is expertise defined within a profession, specifically ASL/English interpreting, so that it assists interpreters in their development from novice to expert levels of expertise?

Both curricula and national certification examinations lack the detailed identification of the necessary skills to perform an expert interpretation. Thus, this research focused on the skills required to render an expert interpretation, specifically, interpreting from English to ASL. The current research included the identification and definition of skills, and the development of a diagnostic assessment instrument to assess interpreters at various skill levels and experiences. The methods used and the findings are described in the balance of this thesis.

CHAPTER 3: INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT AND EXPERT PANEL REVIEW

Overview

The goal of the present research was to develop a practical and useful diagnostic instrument for assessing interpretations from spoken English to its equivalent in American Sign Language (ASL). The instrument was developed by identifying skills generally seen in expert English-to-ASL interpretations. Identification was accomplished by reviewing the related literature and conducting observational analysis of various interpreters with different skill levels and experience.

Once the skills were identified they were grouped by the researcher into eight categories or Major Features: 1) Numbers, 2) Fingerspelling, 3) Classifiers/SASSes, 4) Vocabulary, 5) Structuring Space, 6) Grammar, 7) Interpreting, and 8) Composure and Appearance. A ninth category, Rater's Judgements, was also added to provide the rater with an opportunity to make judgements and provide further diagnostic assessment on the overall performance.

Following an error analysis of interpretations, lists of relevant and representative errors that might be made by an interpreter were developed for each skill within each Major Feature.

A systematic approach to test construction as outlined by Crocker and Algina (1986, pp. 66-84) was followed to develop the instrument. The first seven of the ten steps outlined by Crocker and Algina were used. These were: 1) determine the purposes for which the assessment scores derived from the instrument would be used, 2) identify and describe the behaviors indicative of good interpretation practice, 3) create the test specifications and the method of recording observed behaviors, 4) construct the initial pool of items, 5) review of the instrument by a panel of interpretation experts, 6) field test the instrument using interpreter educators, and 7) analyze the data.

The work and the results corresponding to the first five steps are described in the balance of this chapter. The work and results associated with steps six and seven are described in Chapters 4 and 5, respectively.

Instrument Development

Step 1: Determine the Purposes For Which The Assessment Scores Derived From the Instrument Would Be Used

The purpose of the assessment scores derived from the instrument was to provide interpreters at various skill levels and experience with a detailed diagnostic assessment of their English-to-ASL interpretation skills.

Because the intent was to assess interpretation skills, the assessment of transliterating skills using invented sign systems, such as Signing Exact English or Signing Essential English, was excluded. Transliteration occurs when spoken English is conveyed manually in a signed form of English. This method of relaying information entails the use of two modes, aural and manual, but does not include the use of two languages. It deals only with one language, English. Therefore, assessing transliteration or invented sign systems was not included in the instrument.

The instrument was designed to be useful and practical for interpreters and raters. This was accomplished in two ways. First, current terminology commonly understood within the interpreting profession was employed in the wording of the instrument. The wording used throughout the instrument is what appears in much of the available literature. Second, attempts were made to keep the instrument a manageable length so that it would not require an excessive amount of time to assess an English-to-ASL interpretation, while at the same time maintaining a device of sufficient comprehensiveness to ensure its practical utility.

Step 2: Identify and Describe the Behaviors Indicative of Good Interpretation Practice

Information Sources

Having determined the purpose of the instrument, the domain was defined as English-to-ASL interpreting. Because the instrument was to provide interpreters with a detailed assessment of their English-to-ASL interpretations, it was necessary to clearly define the relevant skills required to provide an expert interpretation from English to ASL.

Information was collected from a variety of sources to define the domain of English-to-ASL interpreting. First, the literature was reviewed to assist in identifying the range of skills demonstrated by novices and experts (interpreting students to expert or certified interpreters). Altogether 72 sources, which are listed in Appendix A, were reviewed.

Another source of information included observations of interpreters who were viewed both directly and on video tape. All observations were conducted by the researcher and included documenting the successful and less than successful elements of the interpretations. The direct observations were done live with no video tape available of the work. In contrast, the video taped interpretations were reviewed several times.

There were 439 direct observations and 128 video taped observations. The direct observations were of interpreters with a variety of skill levels and experience. These included a range from novice to expert. The novices included students in an interpreting program or graduates of these programs with less than two years of interpreting experience. The expert interpreters had five or more years of interpreting experience and/or held national certification in interpreting from either the Association of Visual Language Interpreters of Canada, the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, or both.

The direct observations of interpreters were conducted in a number of settings including employment (n=111), educational (n=95), platform (n=78), meetings (n=70), workshops (n=52), and medical assignments (n=33).

The video taped observations included both novice (N=85) and expert (N=43) interpreters. Just over half of the novice interpreters (N=44) were students who attended the Interpreter Training Program at Grant MacEwan Community College in Edmonton, Alberta during the period 1984 to 1989. The remaining novices (N=41) were interpreters from Canada and the United States with less than two years of experience. The expert video tape samples were of interpreters who provided modelled interpretations for interpreting programs at post-secondary institutions. Also, commercially sold video tapes were used, as well as video tapes made from television programs where interpretations were provided. A list of the modelled interpretation video tapes used in this part of the research is provided in Appendix B.

Task Analysis

Using the information gleaned from the literature and the observations of interpreters, a task analysis was conducted to define the assessment domain in terms of the skills required to provide equivalency of meaning from the source language of English to the target language of ASL. The analysis revealed that interpreters who provided more expert interpretations possessed both excellent interpreting skills and ASL language skills. A common characteristic of a less than expert interpretation was deficiency in ASL or target language skills. This being the case, and because the purpose of the instrument was to provide diagnostic feedback to interpreters with varying degrees of skill and experience, it was important the instrument encompass ASL language skills in addition to the interpretation skills required to interpret from English to ASL. If only interpreting was assessed,

the instrument would likely have been less useful for novice and/or less experienced interpreters because many of their interpretation errors were more attributable to ASL deficiencies rather than actual interpreting errors. Therefore, ASL language competency was incorporated into the assessment domain, but only within the context of interpretation. ASL competency was never assessed in isolation, that is, separate from the interpreting process.

In addition to including ASL language competency in the assessment domain along with interpreting competency, the task analysis also revealed that Deaf consumers required different interpretations to match their variations in ASL use related to their range in age and background. For example, is the interpreter working with Deaf children or Deaf adults? If they are adults, are they high school graduates or do they have post-secondary degrees? Specifically, some consumers preferred English mouthing while others did not. Some preferred slower signing and fingerspelling when in a technical lecture; others did not. Therefore, it was necessary to assess the degree to which the interpretation matched the Deaf consumers' needs and preferences. This was also included in the assessment domain.

The task analysis resulted in a compilation of 379 skills which detailed the assessment domain of English-to-ASL interpretation.

Step 3: Create the Test Specifications and the Method of Recording Observed Behaviors and Step 4: Construct the Initial Pool of Items

Categorizing the Skills

With the skills identified, the task then became how to group the skills into a useful format. To accomplish this, skills were clustered into related groupings. For example, skills such as characterization, pronominalization, and locatives were grouped together under the heading 'Structuring Space' because they were all elements related to space. Skills such as non-manual behaviors,

subject-object agreement, and temporal aspect were grouped together under the heading 'Grammar' because they all were related to the grammatical principles of ASL. Some skills were included in more than one group, for example, non-manual behaviors were listed in Classifiers/SASSes (Size and Shape Specifiers) and Grammar.

Altogether, eight groupings or Major Features of interpretation were identified. They were:

1) Numbers;
2) Fingerspelling;
3) Classifiers/SASSes;
4) Vocabulary;
5) Structuring Space;
6) Grammar;
7) Interpreting; and
8) Composure and Appearance.

In addition to assessing individual skills within each Major Feature, there was also a need to assess the interpretation globally. Thus, a ninth section was added. This section, 'Judgements', allowed for overall impressions and comments on the interpretation. It allowed for a narrative summation of the skills noted in the interpretation. For example, comments like 'the conduct the interpreter exhibits is appropriate' and 'the interpretation would be understood by a deaf ASL consumer (not bilingual)' were placed in this section.

Making the Instrument Manageable

As mentioned above, as a result of the task analysis, 379 skills were identified. For example, a partial list of the skills associated with interpretation of numbers is presented in Table 1. Inclusion of all skills for each Major Feature would lead to an instrument that would be impractical due to the excessive amount of time that would be required to rate an interpretation.

Table 1
Partial List of Skills Related to Interpreting Numbers Accurately

1.	The number is signed accurately
2.	Accurate number is signed
3.	Takes only one time to do it right (e.g., no false starts)
4.	Numbers expressed in English are expressed in ASL (e.g., ability to alter English phrases "eleven hundred and two" into ASL "ONE THOUSAND, ONE HUNDRED, TWO")
5.	Number/concept is shown accurately in terms of plurality
6.	Accurate use of non specific number signs (e.g., few, many)
7.	Accurate numbering system
8.	Accurate in signing cardinal numbers (e.g., ONE, TWO)
9.	Accurate in signing ordinal numbers (e.g., FIRST, SECOND)
10.	Accurate in signing age (e.g., FIVE-YEARS-OLD)
11.	Accurate in signing time/o'clock (e.g., FIVE-O'CLOCK, ONE-MINUTE)
12.	Accurate in signing height (e.g., SIX-FEET-TALL)
13.	Accurate in signs related to sports (e.g., MAPLE LEAFS FOUR + OILERS FIVE)
14.	Accurate in signing money/currency (e.g., FIVE-CENTS)
15.	Accurate in signing calendar (e.g., ONE-WEEK, EVERY-YEAR)

To make the lists more manageable without deleting skills, the skills were aggregated into a fewer number of skills which encompassed the skills combined without a loss of information. Returning to the previous example, 'interpretation of numbers', the initial set of skills was aggregated into three skills as follows: skills numbered 2-5 were aggregated with skill 1; skill 6 remained unchanged, and skills numbered 8-15 were aggregated with skill 7. Thus, out of the 15 initially identified skills, 3 skills were formed:

the number is signed accurately; accurate use of non-specific number signs (e.g., FEW, MANY); and accurate numbering system.

This process was used for all of the identified skills. Table 2 illustrates the number of original skills identified in the task analysis as well as the number of skills remaining after aggregating them within each Major Feature.

Table 2
Number of Original Skills Aggregated to Lesser Numbers by Major Features

Major Feature	Number of Skills	
	Original	Aggregated
Numbers	41	11
Fingerspelling	35	10
Classifiers/SASSes	41	13
Vocabulary	26	5
Structuring Space	59	13
Grammar	63	13
Interpreting	84	22
Composure and Appearance	22	5
Judgements	8	7
TOTALS	379	99

Sequencing the Features and Skills

The eight Major Features and the 'Judgements' section were then sequenced to facilitate use. Applying the research on knowledge-lean tasks and knowledge-rich tasks (e.g., Chi et al., 1988) the features were sequenced beginning with specific features (i.e., knowledge-lean tasks) required during portions of the interpretation followed by comprehensive features (i.e., knowledge-rich tasks) that were required throughout the interpretation. The

Major Feature of Numbers was placed first because in many interpretations numbers are often only present in specific segments of an interpretation. Fingerspelling was placed second. Fingerspelling tends to be more common in most interpretation samples than numbers. In contrast, the skills contained in Grammar and Interpreting are necessary throughout the interpretation and consideration of the entire interpretation sample would be required to rate them. Therefore, these two Major Features were placed sixth and seventh, respectively. Composure and Appearance was placed eighth because these skills are also necessary throughout the entire interpretation.

Within each Major Feature, the skills were sequenced from essential to desirable skills. The criterion used was the degree to which inaccuracy or inappropriateness of the interpretation was likely to affect consumers' comprehension of the message. When misunderstanding was the likely outcome of the inaccurate or inappropriate interpretation, then the skill was identified as essential. When misunderstanding was not the likely outcome of the inaccurate or inappropriate interpretation, the skill was identified as desirable. Table 3 lists the number of essential and desirable skills for each Major Feature.

Continuing with a numbering example, an essential skill was 'the number is signed accurately'. The message would likely be misunderstood if the ASL interpretation was '25' instead of '250'. Therefore, this skill was identified as essential. In contrast, 'the accurate numbering system is used' was identified as desirable because the message could still be understood accurately even if the numbering system was executed inaccurately. For example, if the palm orientation and the movement required for a numbering system such as a person's height was not done accurately, but the numbers themselves were signed accurately, then the message could still be understood.

Table 3
The Number of Essential and Desirable Skills within Each Major Feature

Major Feature	No. of Essential Skills	No. of Desirable Skills
Numbers	3	8
Fingerspelling	3	7
Classifiers/SASSes	7	6
Vocabulary	2	3
Structuring Space	7	6
Grammar	6	7
Interpreting	7	15
Composure and Appearance	1	4
Judgements	7	0

Defining the Domain

There is a range of performance from accurate to inaccurate and from appropriate to inappropriate. To resolve this issue, objective criteria had to be developed to determine when a skill was accurate or appropriate. An error analysis was conducted to accomplish this task.

The error analysis actually took place at the same time as the task analysis. In addition to looking at the skills during the task analysis, errors were analyzed and recorded. The result was the identification of a list of representative and relevant possible errors for each particular skill. Through this process, the particular skill, that is, the focal construct, was defined by the corresponding list of possible errors. An illustrative example is provided in Table 4 which describes the momentum of signing numbers. Ideally, when signing numbers the momentum should be smooth. However, if it is

not smooth, six possible types of errors were identified that may skew the meaning.

Table 4
Errors Related to the Momentum of Signing Numbers

SKILL: Momentum is smooth
A. There are no pauses between series of numbers (e.g., 5,438 & 1,959)
B. No pauses
C. Pauses in the middle of a number (e.g.,1,9-pause-49 appearing to be two separate numbers)
D. Jerky/choppy
E. There are extraneous movements present
F. The movement is incomplete

To further describe the skills and their associated errors, examples were added whenever possible. Keeping in mind the instrument was for use in North America, both Canadian and American examples were used. To illustrate, the error 'inaccurate in signs related to sports' was accompanied with, 'e.g., Maple Leafs four + Oilers five', two Canadian teams belonging to the National Hockey League.

Summary of Steps One to Four

The purpose of the instrument was to develop a practical and useful diagnostic instrument for assessing interpretations from English to ASL.

The domain was defined and characterized by including both ASL and interpreting skills because these two competencies were interrelated.

The outcome of the instrument development phase of the research was a diagnostic instrument consisting of eight Major Features. Each feature contained a list of skills, or focal constructs, with each skill followed by one or more representative and relevant possible errors. The collection of errors for a particular skill provided an definition of that skill.

In addition to the eight Major Features, a ninth category, 'Judgements', was added to allow a global assessment of the interpretation sample. The Major Features, 'Judgements', and the skills within each feature were sequenced for ease of use by the rater.

The result of completing this phase of the research was the initial draft of the diagnostic assessment instrument for English-to-ASL interpretations.

Panel Review

Step 5: Review of the Instrument By a Panel of Interpretation Experts

Following the initial development of the instrument, a panel of 14 experts reviewed it. The purpose of this review was to validate the Major Features and the skills with their associated errors within each Major Feature. The experts and the procedures they followed are described in the balance of this chapter.

Selecting the Panel

Panel members were chosen on the basis of their expertise in the field of interpreting and either their participation at the annual meeting of the Canadian Association for the Education of Sign Language Interpreters (CAESLI) or their proximity to the meeting location. CAESLI is an organization of interpreter educators which attracts participants from across Canada.

CAESLI was established in 1985 to provide a forum for Canadian interpreter educators to meet and discuss common issues within their programs with the ultimate goal of improving interpreting programs across the country. New programs were being established and educators recognized that there was a need to meet regularly and share materials and curriculum to make the limited available resources extend to their fullest.

Hearing and Deaf experts who would be attending the annual CAESLI meeting in Winnipeg, Manitoba, October 9 to 11, 1991 were contacted via electronic mail and invited to participate on an expert review panel for a newly developed instrument designed to assess English-to-ASL interpretations. They were given the day, time and location of the meeting which coincided with the CAESLI meeting but did not conflict with any CAESLI function. Invitations were also issued to interpreter educators who lived in Winnipeg but were not attending the CAESLI meetings.

Altogether 15 invitations were issued and all 15 people agreed to participate in the research. Subsequently, one was unable to complete the task due to personal conflicts. Thus, the results cited in this step of the validation process are based on the work of 14 expert panelists.

All the experts resided in Canada. None of them had prior involvement with developing the instrument. Collectively they were interpreter educators and/or administrators representing six different interpreting programs from across Canada: Douglas College in Vancouver, British Columbia, Grant MacEwan Community College in Edmonton, Alberta, Red River Community College in Winnipeg, Manitoba, Sheridan College of Applied Arts and Technology in Brampton, Ontario, St. Clair College of Applied Arts and Technology in Windsor, Ontario and Université du Québec à Montréal, Québec.

Hearing Experts' Qualifications

The experts completed a form (see Appendix C) outlining their expertise. As shown in Table 5, eight of the fourteen experts who participated in the panel review validation stage of the instrument were hearing and all eight were actively interpreting. They ranged in age from 30 to 45 years, with a mean age of 36.6 years. Six of the eight were ASL/English interpreters. One was LSQ/French and one was a Spanish/English interpreter. English was the native language of six experts. One of the experts was a native French speaker and one was a native ASL user.

All except one had experience teaching interpreters. Their experience ranged from 3 to 15 years, with a mean of 7.3 years. Seven of the experts had experience teaching in interpreting programs with six of them also having experience in teaching continuing education courses and/or workshops to professional interpreters.

Three people held national certification, the Comprehensive Skills Certificate (CSC), from the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf in the United States. One of these people also held the Certificate of Interpretation (COI) from the Association of Visual Language Interpreters of Canada. A fourth expert held only the COI. Of the remaining four people, two interpreted for languages where no equivalent certification exam existed, that is, Spanish/English and LSQ/French, and two, who were involved in developing the COI for AVLIC, were not able to undergo the certification process because of their involvement.

In terms of membership in local and national organizations, seven belonged to at least one local interpreting organization (i.e., Ontario Association of Sign Language Interpreters, Western Association of Visual Language Interpreters, Manitoba Association of Visual Language Interpreters, Alberta Chapter of the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, and Association Québeqois des Interprètes Francophones en Langage Visuel.) All belonged to AVLIC, with two

Table 5
Hearing Experts' Qualifications

(N=8)

Interpreting experience	
Actively interpreting	8
ASL/English interpreters	6
LSQ/French	1
Spanish/English	1
Native language	
English	6
French	1
ASL	1
Experience teaching interpreters	
Experience teaching interpreting students and professional interpreters	6
Experience teaching only interpreting students	1
No experience teaching interpreters	1
Certification(s) held	
CSC and COI	1
COI	1
CSC	2
Not applicable	4
Membership in organizations	
Local interpreting organizations	7
CAESLI and CIT	4
CAESLI only	2
AVLIC and RID	2
AVLIC only	6

also belonging to RID. Six of the eight belonged to CAESLI with four belonging to both CAESLI and its sister organization, the Conference of Interpreter Trainers (CIT) in the United States.

Deaf Experts' Qualifications

Six of the fourteen member panel were Deaf. All six were native ASL users with one native bilingual in ASL and English. Their ages ranged from 30 to 45 years, with a mean of 36.6 years. They possessed from 13 to 20 years of experience using interpreters, with a mean of 17.3 years. They all had experience using seasoned interpreters, and all except one had experience using new interpreters.

All had experience teaching ASL to hearing adults who were not interpreters. Five also had experience teaching ASL to interpreters and three had experience teaching ASL to children. The range in teaching experience was from 1.5 to 16 years, with a mean of 7.9 years.

All six belonged to at least one local deaf organization (e.g., Edmonton Association of the Deaf, Alberta Cultural Society of the Deaf, British Columbia Cultural Society of the Deaf, Greater Vancouver Association of the Deaf, or Western Canadian Association of the Deaf). Two belonged to two local deaf organizations with one of them belonging to three. All except one belonged to at least one national organization, either the Canadian Association of the Deaf (CAD) or the Canadian Cultural Society of the Deaf (CCSD) with two of them belonging to both. A summary of the qualifications of the Deaf members of the panel is provided in Table 6.

Table 6
Deaf Experts' Qualifications

(N=6)

Qualifications	
Native language(s)	
ASL only	5
Bilingual ASL and English	1
Experience using interpreters	
Seasoned interpreters and new interpreters	5
Only seasoned interpreters	1
Experience teaching ASL to	
Hearing adults, interpreters and children	3
Hearing adults and interpreters	2
Only hearing adults	1
Membership in deaf organizations	
3 local organizations	1
2 local organizations	2
1 local organization	3
CAD and CCSD	2
CAD and/or CCSD	3

Meeting With the Experts

Prior to the experts actually reviewing the instrument, the researcher met with the panel members to describe their task in the first validation process, the instrument development procedures to date, and the future validation procedures planned. Briefly, the panel members were asked to conduct a line-by-line review of the instrument and told that this was the first step in the overall validation process. The purpose of the instrument was then

described. The description outlined the need to assess English-to-ASL interpretations and to provide diagnostic feedback to interpreters with varying degrees of skills and experience. The basic premise was that at any time an interpreter could be an expert or a novice depending on the setting and a multitude of other factors such as familiarity with the content of the message and the pace of the speaker.

The general format of the instrument was then described. It was explained that the instrument assessed both ASL and interpreting skills, and that the ASL skills were only assessed within the context of interpretation.

In addition, the components of the instrument which were not completed, but which would be included at a future date, were described. These components included the addition of definitions corresponding to each skill and a rating scale which would be used to assess the level of performance. Lastly, the next steps in the validation process were outlined for the panel members.

It was not possible for all of the invited experts to meet at the same time. The researcher met with eleven of the fourteen experts in a three-hour open forum format. The remaining three were consulted individually, at their convenience.

The open forum with eleven experts was conducted in ASL because this was the language most common among them. One of the experts interpreted into English for two whose languages were other then ASL. Following the introductory remarks and explanation of the work they were to perform, the researcher answered their questions.

Just prior to beginning their review, they were informed that their names would be held in confidence and that no individual results would be reported. All of their comments and suggestions would be grouped into summary form, thus allowing the experts more freedom to provide honest feedback without worrying about their comments being associated with their names. They were encouraged to be critical in their review of the instrument.

Specification of the Task for the Panel Members

The responsibilities of the panel members consisted of validating the instrument by using the rating forms provided (see Appendix D). The components to be evaluated included the

-list of Major Features;
-lists of skills within each Major Feature;
-lists of possible errors associated with each skill;
-sequencing of the skills; and
-the clarity of the writing.

The first task of the experts was to examine the list of Major Features using the Major Features Rating Form. They were asked to determine whether the Major Features, as a set, sufficiently described the assessment domain of interpretation from English to ASL. Panel members were asked to add Major Features they thought were pertinent to the assessment domain or to delete Major Features that were not essential to the assessment domain.

The panel then examined the content of each Major Feature using the Expert Rating Forms. One form was used for each Major Feature. They were to determine whether each identified skill and accompanying errors within each Major Feature were relevant to the Major Feature. They were then asked whether the set of skills and their errors was representative of the Feature.

The experts were also asked to differentiate between essential skills and desirable skills within each feature. The criterion for differentiating these was the degree to which inaccuracy or inappropriateness of the interpretation was likely to affect the consumers' comprehension of the message. Essential skills were defined as those skills that had to be executed accurately and/or appropriately in order to have equivalency of meaning between the English source language and the ASL interpretation to comprehend the meaning. Desirable skills were defined as those skills which if executed inaccurately or

inappropriately, might skew the message but not likely result in misunderstandings.

They were also asked to examine the sequencing of the skills listed within each Major Feature. The skills were listed from most essential to least desirable. If they disagreed with the sequence presented, then they were asked to reorder the skills to what they thought was a more appropriate sequence.

Finally, they were asked to review the writing of each item for its technical adequacy and freedom from bias, taking particular note of whether the terminology was accurate, current, and appropriate.

Panel Review Procedures

The panel members who attended the meeting worked individually in the same room. They were encouraged to ask questions or to seek clarification. They were asked not to confer with each other or to ask questions of anyone except the researcher.

Sign Language books, interpreting books, and reference materials used within the interpreting profession both by interpreting educators and professional interpreters were available for them to use. Most of the resources, if not all, were very familiar to the panel members.

Three panel members needed additional time to complete their work; all returned their completed instrument at a later date either in person or by mail. The remaining eight completed their work by the end of the meeting.

The three panel members who were unable to attend the open forum worked individually after receiving instructions in person from the researcher.

Debriefing was conducted either at the end of the meeting for those who were in attendance or at a personal meeting when the work was completed individually. The researcher reminded the panel members to keep confidential the information related to the

instrument because at a future date other experts in the field would further validate of the instrument.

Analysis of Validation Panel Data

The data from the fourteen members of the validation panel were aggregated for each Major Feature, skill, and error. Written comments were color coded to distinguish Deaf from hearing experts. This allowed cross-referencing on each item and provided a means to assess the consistency among panel members within and between the hearing and Deaf groups.

Comments were also numbered to identify them by panel member so that the researcher could request further clarification, if needed. As it turned out, the comments from all of the experts were clearly articulated and there was no need to ask for further clarification.

Results of the Panel Review

Panelists' General Comments

Panel members indicated that the instrument, as planned, would fill a necessary gap in assessment methods currently available for English-to-ASL interpretation. As well, they stated that the instrument was comprehensive, and that it had a wide range of possible uses.

Major Features Revisions

Twelve of the fourteen experts agreed that all of the Major Features were necessary. The two who did not agree thought that Grammar should be incorporated into Interpreting and that Structuring Space should be divided into Spatial Relationships and ASL Structure. Grammar was specifically taken out of interpreting

so as to rate the command of language, as separately as possible, from the actual interpreting task. Spatial relationships were already a sub-component of the Major Feature Structuring Space and ASL structure was already included within Grammar. Thus, the Major Features were kept as originally written with one exception; the title of the last section, Judgement, was changed to Rater's Impressions. Several of the panelists suggested that the title was more appropriate given the nature of the rating task.

Sequence of Major Features Revisions

Based on the data provided by the panel review, the sequencing of the Major Features was altered as noted in Table 7. As shown, Numbers and Fingerspelling, Classifiers/SASSes and Vocabulary, and Structuring Space and Grammar were reversed. No feature was displaced further than one Major Feature away from its original position. The last two Major Features, Interpreting and Composure and Appearance, remained in their original order, followed by the last section, Rater's Impressions.

Table 7
Major Features Sequence Revisions as a Result of the Panel Review

Initial Sequence	Revised Sequence
Numbers	Fingerspelling
Fingerspelling	Numbers
Classifiers/SASSes	Vocabulary
Vocabulary	Classifiers/SASSes
Structuring Space	Grammar
Grammar	Structuring Space
Interpreting	Interpreting
Composure and Appearance	Composure and Appearance
Judgements	Rater's Impressions

Skills and Errors Revisions

As a result of the panel review, the lists of skills and errors within each Major Feature were considerably revised. A summary of these revisions is provided in Table 8.

Table 8
Revisions of Skills and Errors within Major Features as a Result of the Panel Review

Major Feature	Additions	Deletions	Sequence Changes	Editorial	Aggre-gated	Totals
Numbers	7	6	24	12	17	66
Finger-spelling	14	3	13	11	13	54
Classifiers & SASSes	4	2	15	20	13	54
Vocabulary	17	0	4	4	11	36
Structur-ing Space	4	3	32	16	19	74
Grammar	14	8	12	6	42	82
Interpret-ing	21	7	41	32	24	125
Composure Appearance	6	0	14	6	3	29
TOTALS	87	29	155	107	142	520

The Major Feature of Interpreting had the greatest number of changes with 125 revisions. Grammar had the second highest number of changes, with a total of 82 revisions. The least number of changes were to Vocabulary (36) and Composure and Appearance (29).

Across all eight of the Major Features, the greatest number of revisions was related to the sequencing of the skills and errors. Of the 155 sequence changes, 129 items moved within the same Major Feature, with the remaining 26 moved to different Major Features.

A number of skills and errors were aggregated with other skills and errors. Of the 142, 111 were aggregated within the same Major Feature, with the remaining 31 aggregated with skills and errors within other Major Features.

In the last section of the instrument, Judgements, there was a total of 11 revisions: 4 additions, 1 deletion, 3 editorial changes, and 3 aggregated with other items within Judgements.

Additions to Complete the Instrument

Definitions

Definitions were added corresponding to each skill with its related list of possible errors to clarify their meaning and to assist raters in the assessment process. The definitions were numbered with the same number of the skill they defined. They were printed on the left page corresponding to the appropriate skill on the right page. Depending on the length of the definitions, and the length of the skills and errors they defined, one to three skills were on each of the right pages. The number of skills and definitions never exceeded three per page. This meant the user would read the first definition on the left page and then, before moving down the page to the second definition, would read the first skill with its list of possible errors on the right page. Then, for the second skill, go back to the left page continuing in the same manner.

With the definitions in place and with the goal of providing interpreters with diagnostic feedback, blank lines were added after each list of possible errors to allow space for the rater to make specific comments on the interpretation performance related to each skill.

Rating Scale

The purpose of the rating scale was for the rater to identify the degree to which the skill was executed accurately or appropriately.

Two rating scales were used. The first, to be used at the skill level, consisted of three options: 1) Y-yes, the skill was performed accurately or appropriately, 2) N-No, the skill was not performed accurately or appropriately, and 3) NT-Not in Target or not present in the interpretation and therefore unable to rate (i.e., not applicable). The second scale for rating the error level, consisted of 4 ordered points: from 1-the skill was performed well to 4-meaning the skill was performed poorly, with points 2 and 3 in the middle of the two extremes.

Instrument

A Table of Contents was added with the eight Major Features and the Rater's Impressions. This became the second page of the instrument preceded by the title page.

Following the panel review validation process and the revisions made to the instrument, it was used in two field tests. The procedures of and the results from these field tests are described in the following two chapters; Chapter 4: Field Test 1 and Chapter 5: Field Test 2.

CHAPTER 4: FIELD TEST 1

Following the development of the instrument, two field tests were conducted. The first, Field Test 1, included two raters from Alberta, Canada. The second, Field Test 2, included seven raters from California, United States.

Both Field Test 1 and Field Test 2 were preliminary tryouts. The raters' responsibilities were to validate the definitions, further validate the skills and errors within each Major Feature, and for the first time actually assess interpretation samples using the instrument. The raters in Field Test 2 also conducted a line-by-line review of the rater's Instruction Manual which was developed after Field Test 1.

Described in this chapter are the methods used for and results from Field Test 1. The corresponding information for Field Test 2 is presented in the following chapter.

Method

Developing the Audio Tape Stimulus

An English stimulus audio cassette tape was developed for use in the field tests. Using this tape as the stimulus, two interpreters interpreted a spoken English message into ASL while being video taped (described in the next section). The message contained on the audio tape was developed to solicit an ASL interpretation that required a wide variety of interpretation skills, thus providing samples of typically found skills that could be rated using the instrument. It was specifically designed to include English text which required the use of skills from all of the Major Features included in the instrument.

The speaker was female. She was asked to develop a formal lecture, approximately five minutes in length, that included all eight

Major Features. A verbatim transcript of this lecture is provided in Appendix E.

The Interpreters

Two interpreters agreed to interpret the English audio tape stimulus while being video taped and to then have their video taped interpretations used for the field tests. The interpreters were chosen to reflect different skill levels, thereby providing a test of the sensitivity of the instrument to different performance levels of interpretation. Both were hearing interpreters residing in Alberta. English was their native language. They learned American Sign Language as a second language through both deaf and hearing people. They attended and graduated from the same one year (35 hours per week) interpreting program. In addition to the one year interpreting program, Interpreter 1 had one year of post-secondary education and Interpreter 2 completed a university undergraduate degree. Neither had obtained certification from AVLIC (Association of Visual Language Interpreters of Canada) or RID (Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf).

Interpreter 1 had five and a half years of interpreting experience, while Interpreter 2 possessed two years of experience. Both freelanced between 15 and 20 hours a week, primarily in employment, medical, and post-secondary education settings. They interpreted for deaf people, some of whom were native signers and others who had learned ASL later in life. Both were members of their local and national interpreting organizations and both attended between 60 and 75 hours of workshops annually.

Developing the Video Tape

Prior to video taping, the interpreters were provided with written directions and told that they were interpreting in a formal setting for a Deaf male, about 35 years of age, whose native

language was ASL. They were also told that the audio tape was five minutes long and included text which required a variety of ASL techniques such as fingerspelling, numbers, structuring space, and classifiers.

After reading the instructions, each interpreter first listened to the first minute of the audio tape. After the audio tape was rewound, they then interpreted the English message into ASL. Even though they heard the first minute, their unrehearsed or "cold" interpretation was similar to the first five minutes of any formal lecture with a minimal amount of information given to the interpreter prior to actually interpreting it.

The interpreters were taped on different days, onto two different video tapes. The audio tape player was set at a comfortable volume for the interpreter to hear and also loud enough for the video tape recorder to record the sound, thereby recording the speaker. Once the interpretation began, the researcher left the room so as to avoid undue pressure brought on by an external observer.

Using the Instrument and Rating Performances

The Raters

Two raters participated in this step of the validation process and provided detailed feedback about the content and the utility of the instrument. The raters were selected on the basis of their expertise in the area of interpreter education and their demonstrated ability to assess interpretations and use interpreting assessment procedures.

Both raters were from Canada and were living in Alberta. They were both female in their thirties. Both were native English speakers and one, Rater 1, was also a native ASL user.

Both raters were hearing with five or more years of teaching experience. In each case, their experience included teaching

students within a post-secondary interpreting program and teaching workshops and continuing education classes to professional interpreters. Rater 1 held both the Certificate of Interpretation from AVLIC and the Comprehensive Skills Certificate offered by RID, while Rater 2 held the Comprehensive Skills Certificate from RID. Both were members of the Canadian Association for the Education of Sign Language Interpreters (CAESLI) and the Conference of Interpreter Trainers (CIT) in the United States. They were also members of AVLIC, RID, the Association of Visual Language Interpreters of Southern Alberta, and the Alberta Chapter of the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf. Neither rater had had involvement with any of the prior steps in the development of the instrument.

Procedures for Rating Performances

The raters agreed to hold two meetings with the researcher over a two day period in the Spring of 1992. The first meeting was held with both raters present and the second meeting was held individually with each rater.

Meeting With Raters Together

The researcher met with the two raters for approximately three hours to discuss the instrument prior to their using it. At this meeting, each was provided with a package of materials. The package for each rater included a copy of the two video tape interpretation samples and three copies of the second draft of the instrument. One copy of the instrument was to be used by the raters to record their written comments and the other two copies were to be used to rate the two interpretation performances.

The goal of the instrument was described to the raters as a "diagnostic assessment of interpretation performances from spoken English to ASL." The instrument was then described in detail as

follows. Eight Major Features of interpretation were identified through a task analysis and an expert panel review. The Major Features were followed by a section for overall assessment. For each Major Feature, related skills were listed, with each skill followed by a list of one or more possible errors. Both the Major Features and the skills within each feature were sequenced into a logical order from knowledge-lean tasks to knowledge-rich tasks. Each list of errors was followed by a series of blank lines in which the rater could document feedback about the interpretation which would then be provided to the interpreter. Each skill with its list of possible errors had a corresponding definition on the opposite page. It was pointed out that the definitions were still at an initial stage.

The anticipated future appearance of the instrument was then described. They were told it would be spiral-bound with each Major Feature printed on a different color of paper to separate one feature from another. The pages and the skills would be numbered consecutively from beginning to end. Also, an instruction manual for the rater would be included with the instrument.

After describing the instrument to the raters, they reviewed it with the researcher present. The researcher answered their questions.

The raters were told to start their assessment at the beginning of the instrument after which they could proceed in any manner that was comfortable for them. For example, they could assess each feature completely before proceeding to the next Major Feature or they could proceed rating specific skills and errors as they appeared in the interpretation.

The raters were also instructed to view the video tape at least once without sound. Viewing without sound provides a different perspective from receiving both a visual and auditory message simultaneously. This could be done at any time during the assessment and it was left up to the raters to decide when and how many times they needed to view the sample without sound.

Assessment of the Sample Interpretations

The raters worked separately in their own homes. This provided for a relaxed and comfortable environment in which to complete the assessments. Each rater had her own television monitor and video playback unit with a remote control. The assessments were done at different times, allowing the researcher to observe each rater while she assessed the video taped interpretations. Rater 1 was observed while conducting both assessments. Due to time limitations, Rater 2 was observed only during her first assessment; the rating took longer than anticipated and thus there was not sufficient time available to observe Rater 2 assess both interpretations. Rater 2 completed her second assessment on her own and returned it with the video tape to the researcher.

Both raters viewed the two video tapes in the same sequence, Interpretation 1 followed by Interpretation 2.

Collecting Raters' Reactions to the Assessment Procedures

Following completion of the first rating, the raters were asked a number of questions regarding the assessment process. First, each was asked to provide general comments. Then each was asked more specific questions on the content, the utility, and the flow of the instrument. They were asked to provide feedback on the stimuli and the rating procedures. The researcher also held discussions with Rater 1 after she completed her second assessment.

In addition to the responses to these questions, the researcher took notes during the two assessments completed by Rater 1 and the first assessment completed by Rater 2. The time required to complete each assessment and the way each rater worked through the instrument was also recorded. Rater 2, who did the second assessment on her own, documented her start and end time for her second assessment.

Findings

Time Required to Complete the Assessments

Rater 1 required 2 hours and 10 minutes to complete her assessment of Interpretation 1 and 1 hour and 55 minutes to assess Interpretation 2. She reported that the instrument was much easier to use the second time. The longer time for the first interpretation may be accounted for by the observation that in addition to completing the assessment, she also made written comments on the instrument's utility and the clarity of the writing. Rater 2 required 1 hour and 30 minutes to complete each of her two interpretation assessments.

Raters' General Comments

Both raters stated that the instrument provided a way to standardize observations of interpretations and commented the instrument was very detailed. They suggested that, because of this detail, they looked for and analyzed skills and errors different from those they typically assessed in their individual work with interpreters. They felt the instrument provided the structure and detail to examine a wide variety of skills and errors.

Both raters commented particularly on the items within the last section, Rater's Impressions. The raters indicated that the questions in this section were very valuable and allowed them to comment on the work in a more global assessment than the eight Major Features. They felt this section provided a good summary of the interpreters' work.

Specific Reactions to the Instrument

Major Features

The raters commented that the instrument was easy to work through. Both raters indicated that the sequence of the Major Features, moving from specific knowledge-lean features to more general knowledge-rich features, was helpful. They stated it was easier to assess Major Features such as Fingerspelling and Numbers before Vocabulary, and Grammar and Structuring Space were easier to assess before Interpreting. They did make one suggestion; Structuring Space should immediately follow Classifiers/SASSes rather than following Grammar.

Skills and Errors

Initially it took time for the raters to locate the applicable skills within the instrument as they were observed in the sample interpretation. For example, while rating the first interpretation, Rater 1 moved back and forth in the instrument, seemingly ignoring the specific order in which the Major Features were listed. At times, she spent time looking for specific skills when the interpretation warranted a comment. However, when rating the second interpretation, Rater 1 followed the sequence of the skills as listed in the instrument more closely, with much less apparantly random movement. In contrast, Rater 2, followed the order of the instrument. Often she previewed the next several pages so as to know the next skills that were to be rated. When she was unable to find the page where a specific comment or a rating should be placed, she wrote them on a blank piece of paper. When the appropriate place to make a specific comment was located, she then copied the corresponding notes from the extra piece of paper onto the instrument.

Both raters commented that the errors, as written in the instrument, associated with the skills were written in a negative rather than a positive manner, making the raters feel their assessment was more negative than positive in approach. This can possibly be accounted for by the fact that educators attempt to highlight the positive in interpreters' work. Even when there is negative feedback to give to the interpreters, it is stated in a positive manner. In the development of the instrument each skill was partially defined by the possible errors that interpreters make when demonstrating particular skills, thus causing the appearance of negativity in the instrument.

Definitions

Both Raters 1 and 2 minimally referred to the definitions while rating. They indicated that they had carefully read the entire instrument, including the definitions, when they first received the materials, and both indicated that they knew the intent of each skill and possible error. They remarked that if they were unsure of the meaning of a particular item, they referred to the examples provided with it. They indicated that the examples were extremely helpful in reminding them what to assess.

Length of Stimulus

Both raters agreed that the length of the tape, five minutes, was sufficient to assess a sample of an interpreter's work. With respect to the sample tape used in the validation process, both raters indicated that the speaker was well paced and that the content of the speech was conducive to viewing samples of skills in each of the eight Major Features.

They both predicted that the time required to rate an interpretation would be reduced after using the instrument with the same audio tape stimulus a number of times.

The Suggested Procedure

Following the researcher's instructions, each rater viewed the interpretations without sound at least once during the assessment procedures. Rater 1 viewed the interpretations with sound several times before viewing it without sound. In contrast, Rater 2 elected to first view the interpretation without sound; she then alternated between viewing with and without sound throughout the rating process.

Rater 1 commented that she did not want to spend time at the beginning listening without sound. However, she suggested that if she were to do it over again, she would first begin without sound and record, on a separate sheet of paper, her initial reactions to the interpretation. Then, using the instrument, she would rate the interpretation with sound.

The 4-Point Rating Scale

Both raters used the 4-point rating scale for the skills without difficulty. However, the raters used the scale to rate errors differently. Rater 1 marked a '1' when there were only 1 or 2 mistakes. It meant that the error was noticeable, but nothing more. Marking a '2' meant either there were a few mistakes, or that a single error was important. This error needed to be addressed and was more serious than the errors rated '1'. If she felt that the performance was very weak and was serious, she marked '3'. She used '4' if the entire performance of that skill was inaccurate.

Rater 2 marked '1' when a few errors were present. When several errors were present but the interpretation was still "comfortable", she used a '2'. When comprehension of the meaning was impeded, she marked a '3'. And finally, she used a '4' when the performance of the skill was inaccurate or when understanding was not possible.

Revisions

Major Features

The sequence of the Major Features was changed in accordance with the suggestion that Structuring Space would be easier to rate if it followed immediately after Classifiers/SASSes. An interpretation using Classifiers/SASSes requires the use of space in a specific manner. Therefore, placing Structuring Space after this feature made good sequential sense. No other changes were made to the sequence of the Major Features.

Skills, Errors, and Definitions

Several changes were made to the skills, errors, and definitions. The number of changes made by type are summarized in Table 9. As shown, the greatest number of changes (41) were made within the Major Feature of Interpreting. Structuring Space had the second highest number, with a total of 33 revisions. The least number of changes occurred in Numbers (2) and Vocabulary (11).

The greatest number of revisions were of an editorial nature. Editorial revisions included adding or changing the example provided with a skill or error, further clarification, and improved consistency in wording, punctuation, and spelling.

After Field Test 1, 17 changes in sequence occurred. All 17 were sequence changes within the same Major Feature. That is, no skills or errors were moved to a different Major Feature; they were only moved within the Major Feature in which they were initially listed.

Some skills and/or errors (26) were aggregated into one. For example, if a skill was redundant and did not provide additional diagnostic value, then it was aggregated with another. Thus, the two skills were combined into one skill without losing any diagnostic information.

Six editorial changes were made to the last section, Rater's Impressions. No other changes were made.

Table 9
Revisions of Skills, Errors, and Definitions within Major Features as a Result of Field Test 1

Major Feature	Additions	Deletions	Sequence Changes	Editorial	Aggre-gated	Totals
Finger-spelling	0	0	0	21	0	21
Numbers	0	0	0	2	0	2
Vocabulary	0	0	3	8	0	11
Classifiers & SASSes	1	2	0	16	0	19
Grammar	5	0	2	10	4	21
Structuring Space	0	0	5	16	12	33
Interpreting	2	0	5	26	8	41
Composure Appearance	0	0	2	11	2	15
TOTALS	8	2	17	110	26	163

Rating Scale

Based on the different ways Rater 1 and Rater 2 used the rating scale for the errors and following further consultation with them, the rating scale was revised as follows:

NT - not in the target message
0 - no errors present
1 - low frequency, low severity
2 - high frequency, low severity
3 - low frequency, high severity
4 - high frequency, high severity.

The addition of scale points NT and 0 allowed raters to specify whether or not a skill was demonstrated in the target language. NT was used to specify that it was not demonstrated in the target language and 0 was used when it was demonstrated in the target language and no errors occurred.

To provide easy reference for the raters, the operational definitions of the rating scale were provided in the revised instrument at the beginning of each Major Feature.

Additions Made to the Instrument

To assist raters in locating specific skills and errors a Cross Reference Index was developed and placed at the back of the instrument. The Cross Reference Index listed specific skills and their corresponding number(s) to assist the raters in locating particular skills.

The numbering of the definitions with their corresponding skills and errors was revised so that it was consecutive from the beginning to the end of the instrument as opposed to each Major Feature starting with '1'. To assist raters in locating specific sections in the interpretation that they felt would elicit certain skills, a transcript of the audio tape stimulus was written.

After viewing raters actually use the instrument, it became apparent that the space provided for comments and feedback was insufficient. Therefore, additional space was provided.

Because of the importance of viewing the interpretation without sound, a reminder was added at the beginning of each Major Feature for the rater to view the interpretation at least twice

without sound. Both Rater 1 and Rater 2 indicated that viewing the interpretation only once was not sufficient. Thus, the requirement to view it at least twice without sound was added and placed on the same page as the operational definitions for the rating scale.

Results of the Revisions

The third draft of the instrument was spiral bound so that it would lay flat, thereby permitting the rater to assess the interpretation without having to hold it open. Also, by laying the instrument flat, the rater could simultaneously see the definitions on the left page and the corresponding skills and possible errors on the right page. Each Major Feature, Rater's Impressions, and the Cross Reference Index were printed on different colors of paper to help distinguish one section from another.

Preparation of the Instruction Manual

Following Field Test 1, an Instruction Manual was developed to accompany the revised instrument. The Manual contained information on the instrument's purpose and goals along with its limitations. The organization of the instrument was described as well as the terminology used. For example, because ASL is not a written language, the writing of ASL was discussed and examples were provided to clarify the meaning of the writing. The qualifications of the user, the rater, were described and the administration procedures and the rating process were explained.

Eleven sections were included in the manual: Purpose and Goals, Terminology, Limitations, Assumptions, Rater Qualifications, Instrument Format, The Stimulus, Administration Procedures, Rating Process, Results, and References.

CHAPTER 5: FIELD TEST 2

Following Field Test 1 and the revisions made to the instrument, a second field test was conducted with raters from California. The raters used the third draft of the instrument with the instruction manual to rate two five-minute video taped interpretation samples. The methods used for and the results from Field Test 2 are described and discussed in the balance of this chapter.

Method

The Audio Tape Stimulus

The English audio tape stimulus used for Field Test 2 was the same as that used in Field Test 1. No changes were made to the stimulus audio tape.

The Interpreters

A change in interpreters was made for Field Test 2. The non-certified, experienced interpreter used in Field Test 1 was replaced by a certified, experienced interpreter for Field Test 2. The latter interpreter held certification from both national interpreter organizations in North America, AVLIC and RID. Thus, external validation of the interpreter's interpretation ability was acknowledged by two national certifying bodies and it could be said this interpreter was an expert. This interpreter was called Interpreter 3 to avoid confusion with Field Test 1.

Interpreter 3 had 10 years of interpreting experience. She freelanced 20 hours a week primarily in mental health, legal, and educational (K-12) settings. Annually, she attended between 150-170 hours of workshops related to interpreting.

Interpreter 3 learned ASL through both hearing and Deaf people. She had a Deaf family member and was not a graduate of an

interpreting program. She held a university degree in a field different from interpreting.

She was a female, native English speaker living in Alberta and was a member of both the local and national interpreter organizations.

Developing the Video Tape

Interpreter 3 was video taped following the same procedures as those used in Field Test 1.

Using the Instrument and Rating Performances

The Raters

To locate a group of raters who had no prior involvement in the developmental stages of the instrument, raters were selected from the United States. This selection took place because the number of qualified Canadians without prior involvement with the previous development and validation stages of the instrument was insufficient.

A location in California was selected that had a group of raters qualified to assist in Field Test 2. Ten raters, living in the same geographic region, were contacted by phone and asked if they were willing to participate in a field study to further validate a newly developed ASL/English diagnostic assessment instrument. The raters were chosen due to their expertise and experience in English/ASL interpretation and interpreter assessment either in the classroom and/or on the job. All had experience assessing interpreters at various skill levels. Other than one, who had limited exposure to portions of the instrument in an editorial capacity, none of the raters were involved in the developmental stages of the instrument.

Of the ten r ..rs asked, nine agreed to participate. Consequently, one person indicated he could not complete the task due to the lack of time he had available. Of the remaining eight, one was unable to complete the task due to health reasons, although she was able to review the instrument and instruction manual providing written and oral comments in a meeting held with the researcher. The seven remaining raters were able to complete the task.

A summary of the qualifications of the seven raters who completed the task is provided in Table 10.

All of the seven raters were members of and held national certification from RID (Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf). Five held the Comprehensive Skills Certificate (CSC) and two held the Master Comprehensive Skills Certificate (MCSC) which RID offered for a short period of time to those who had already received a CSC and were tested again.

Table 10
Field Test 2 Rater Qualifications

Qualifications	Raters						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Certified	CSC	CSC	CSC	CSC	MCSC	CSC	MCSC
Years Evaluating interps	10	6	12	13	20	5	18
Years teaching	10	0	13	13	20	5	18
Native ASL	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
Native English	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

All seven had experience evaluating interpreters. This experience ranged from 5 to 20 years with a mean of 12 years. Six of the seven raters had experience teaching interpreters in an educational environment. This experience ranged from 5 to 20 years with a mean of 13.2 years. All six taught both interpreting students and employed interpreters and all except one were currently teaching. The one rater with no teaching experience worked primarily as an evaluator of employed interpreters on a regular basis, but did not provide formal education to them.

Only one of the seven identified herself as a native ASL user and all seven were native English speakers. All seven raters were female ranging in age from 31 to 65 years, with a mean of 45.

Procedures for Rating Performances

Due to prior time commitments, two of the seven raters who completed the task were unable to attend the scheduled meeting. Consequently, separate meetings were held with these two raters; the researcher met with the remaining five in a group.

Group Meeting

The five raters received a copy of the instrument and instruction manual two weeks in advance of the researcher's arrival to California. They were asked to read the materials and make written comments prior to the scheduled group meeting with the researcher. All were told that discussions about the instrument and the instruction manual would be held at the conclusion of the assessments. Thus, all seven raters had to depend on the instruction manual for the information they needed to conduct the assessments.

The meeting began with each of the five raters completing the assessment of one of the two interpretation samples in an assigned random order. Each had her own video playback unit, monitor, and video tape. Four of the five machines had a remote control. They

were each given a blank instrument to mark as well as a written English transcript of the interpreted lecture. They were asked to record any comments about the instrument and rating procedures on the instrument and the instruction manual mailed earlier to them. Each worked independently.

After all of the five raters had completed rating the first interpretation and after a lunch break, a discussion was held on the content and the utility of the instrument. Because the discussion lasted the rest of the afternoon, it was not possible to complete the assessment of the second interpretation sample in the group setting. The five raters agreed to complete the second rating on their own time and mail the video tape, completed instruments, and manual back to the researcher.

Individual Meetings

As with the raters who attended the scheduled group meeting, the two raters unable to attend the meeting received a copy of the instrument and instruction manual. In addition, they also received the two video tape interpretations, the written English transcript of the lecture corresponding to the interpretations, and two instruments to be used for the assessments.

The researcher met with the two raters individually. One completed assessing both interpretations; the other assessed one interpretation sample. On each occasion, the raters discussed the instrument and the rating process with the researcher.

Collecting Raters' Reactions to the Assessment Procedures

The researcher orally asked the raters questions, five in the group meeting and two individually, about their reactions to the assessment instrument and rating procedures. First, they were asked to provide general comments. Then they were asked more specific questions on the content, the utility, and the flow of the

instrument. The questions asked were the same as the questions asked in Field Test 1 with the addition of questions regarding the instruction manual.

In addition to the responses to these questions, the researcher took notes during the assessments conducted in the group setting. Of particular importance was the way in which the raters worked through the instrument.

Findings

Time Required to Complete the Assessments

Table 11 summarizes the time it took each rater to complete the rating for each sample interpretation, along with which sample interpretation was rated first and which was rated second. As indicated earlier, five raters, 2-5, completed their first assessment in the presence of the researcher and their second one while alone. Raters 1 and 7 completed both of the assessments without the researcher being present.

The mean for the length of time required to complete the assessment for Interpretation 2, rated first by Raters 1-4, was 2 hours and 8.75 minutes with a standard deviation of 41.29 minutes. The mean for Interpretation 3, which was rated first by Raters 5-7, was 2 hours with a standard deviation of 0.

When assessing their second interpretation sample, the mean was 2 hours with a standard deviation of 0 for Interpretation 2 and a mean of 1 hour and 52.5 minutes and a standard deviation of 33.45 minutes for Interpretation 3. Although there was more variance among the raters when assessing Interpretation 3 than Interpretation 2, the length of time required to complete the assessment was less.

Table 11
Time Required to Rate Interpretation Samples 2 and 3 across Seven Raters

Interpre-
tation Raters

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	SD
2 rated first	1 hr. 10 min.	3 hrs. 5 min.	2 hrs. 20 min.	2 hrs.				2 hrs. 8.75 min.	41.29 min.
3 rated first					2 hrs.	2 hrs.	2 hrs.	2 hrs.	0
2 rated second					2 hrs.	2 hrs.	2 hrs.	2 hrs.	0
3 rated second	1 hr. 30 min.	2 hrs. 50 min.	1 hr. 40 min.	1 hr. 30 min.				1 hr. 52.5 min.	33.45 min.
Difference between first and second rating	20 min. more	15 min. less	40 min. less	30 min. less	no change	no change	no change		

Three raters, 2, 3, and 4, who first rated Interpretation 2 followed by Interpretation 3, completed their second assessment in 15 to 40 minutes less time than it took them to complete their first assessment. Rater 1, rating the interpretations in the same order, took 20 minutes longer for the second assessment.

The three raters, 5, 6, and 7, who first rated Interpretation 3 followed by Interpretation 2, required the same amount of time (2 hours) to rate each interpretation sample.

Based on the researcher's observations and the comments of the raters, several plausible explanations account for the differences in the amount of time required to rate the interpretation samples. Rater 1, who took longer to complete the second assessment, hurried during the first assessment to meet with the researcher at a predetermined time. This could explain why it took Rater 1 longer the second time.

Two possible reasons for the decrease in time are practice and the sequence of rating the samples. All seven raters stated that the rating task was easier the second time, because they knew the instrument and where skills were located better, thereby reducing their reliance on the Cross Reference Index.

Raters 1, 2, 3, and 4 rated interpretation 2, the novice, followed by interpretation 3, the expert. Three of the four took less time. In contrast, Raters 5, 6, and 7 rated the expert first with no change in the time it required to rate the novice. One possible explanation of these findings is that less time is required to rate an expert than a novice. However, practice also must be taken into account. Although these raters had practice with the instrument, it did not take them less time. Even with practice it may not be possible to rate a novice interpreter in less time than an expert.

Rating Consistency Within Raters

As part of the process for determining the utility of the instrument, rating consistency between skill ratings and corresponding error ratings within each of the seven raters was analyzed. The findings showed that there was slightly less than 100% consistency within each rater. That is, when the skill was rated 'No', meaning the skill was not performed accurately, then at least one of the subsequent errors was rated between 1 and 4. When the skill was rated 'Yes', meaning the skill was performed accurately, then in all of the subsequent related errors either '0' or 'NT' was marked; there were no errors present. When NT, not in the

target message, was marked for the skill, then in all of the subsequent related errors 'NT' was marked.

Agreement Among Raters Across Skills Within Each Major Feature

The agreement among raters on the skills within each Major Feature for Interpretation 2 and Interpretation 3 is described in this section.

Interpretation 2

Table 12 summarizes the agreement among raters across the skills within each Major Feature. The table indicates the number of skills in each Major Feature, how many times at least five raters agreed on their rating for the skills, and the percent of skills for which they agreed on their rating.

At the skill level for Interpretation 2, the Major Feature of Vocabulary with four skills had the highest agreement. At least five of the raters agreed on each of the four skills included within Vocabulary. Good agreement was present in three additional Major Features: Fingerspelling with 80%, Classifiers/SASSes with 71%, and Structuring Space with 71%.

The lowest agreement was in the Major Feature of Numbers with 43% agreement. Interpreting and Composure and Appearance had 50% agreement with Grammar having slightly more agreement at 66%.

With the exception of Numbers, the rating of the skills in the first five Major Features had higher agreement than the latter three Major Features. One possible reason for this is the difference between the knowledge-lean and knowledge-rich Major Features. Perhaps it is easier to agree on the knowledge-lean features, requiring assessment of isolated skills, than the knowledge-rich features, requiring assessments of skills occurring throughout the entire interpretation.

Table 12
Agreement Among Raters for Interpretation 2 across Skills within Each Major Feature

Major Features	No. of skills	No. of skills at least 5 raters agreed	Percent of agreement of at least 5 raters
Fingerspelling	10	8	80
Numbers	7	3	43
Vocabulary	4	4	100
Classifiers/ SASSes	7	5	71
Structuring Space	7	5	71
Grammar	6	4	66
Interpreting	14	7	50
Composure and Appearance	4	2	50
TOTALS	59	38	64

Interpretation 3

The agreement among raters on the skills in each Major Feature for Interpretation 3 is summarized in Table 13. At the skill level for Interpretation 3, the Major Feature of Composure and Appearance had the highest agreement at 100%. Good agreement was present in one additional Major Feature: Vocabulary with 75%. The lowest agreement, 29% occurred in both Classifiers/SASSes and Structuring Space. The agreement for the remaining four Major Features ranged from 50 to 64%.

Table 13
Agreement Among Raters for Interpretation 3 across Skills within Each Major Feature

Major Features	No. of skills	No. of skills at least 5 raters agreed	Percent of agreement of at least 5 raters
Fingerspelling	10	5	50
Numbers	7	4	57
Vocabulary	4	3	75
Classifiers/ SASSes	7	2	29
Structuring Space	7	2	29
Grammar	6	3	50
Interpreting	14	9	64
Composure and Appearance	4	4	100
TOTALS	59	32	54

Agreement Among Raters Across Errors within Each Major Feature

As a result of the raters' comments in Field Test 1 and after checking back with the raters in Field Test 2, the assessment ratings at the error level were aggregated to determine differences between 1) errors either not present or negligible, 2) frequent occurrence of errors but not severe errors, and 3) severe errors. The following three groupings were formed:

a) NT, O, 1
b) 2
c) 3, 4.

In group (a) either no errors were present, '0' or 'NT', or the error was negligible with a rating of '1'. In group (b) the error occurred frequently but was not severe in terms of the potential for misunderstandings. In group (c) the error was severe, either occurring occasionally or frequently.

Interpretation 2

The agreement among raters on the assessment rating of the errors across Major Features in Interpretation 2 is illustrated in Table 14. Changes in percent of agreement occurred from the skill level to the error level on Interpretation 2. Agreement for Classifiers, Interpreting, and Composure and Appearance from the skill level of 71%, 50%, and 50% was increased at the error level to 88%, 76% and 88%, respectively. Numbers had the most significant increase which was from 43% at the skill level to 100% at the error level.

There was a decrease in agreement from Vocabulary, Structuring Space, and Grammar at the skill level of 100%, 71% and 66%, to the error level of 90%, 46% and 56%, respectively.

The Major Feature of Fingerspelling remained the same at 80% for both the skill level and the error level.

The first four Major Features, the more knowledge-lean features, had more agreement than three of the four knowledge-rich features. This is consistent with the rating at the skill level for Interpretation 2.

Also, the agreement overall for Interpretation 2 is higher at the error level (77%) when compared to the rating of the skill level (64%). This may indicate that reporting agreement at the skill level is too gross of a measurement and that reporting at the error level is more appropriate and informative.

Table 14

Rater Agreement on Interpretation 2 across Errors at the Aggregated Rating Level within Each Major Feature

Major Features	No. of errors	No. of errors at least 5 raters agreed	Percent of agreement of at least 5 raters
Fingerspelling	20	16	80
Numbers	19	19	100
Vocabulary	20	18	90
Classifiers/ SASSes	17	15	88
Structuring Space	24	11	46
Grammar	18	10	56
Interpreting	42	32	76
Composure and Appearance	17	15	88
TOTALS	177	136	77

Interpretation 3

As indicated in Table 15, the agreement across Major Features at the error level was very good. Four of the eight features had 100% agreement with the remaining four ranging in agreement from 88 - 95%. Again the first four Major Features had higher agreement than the latter, more knowledge-rich features, with the exception of Composure and Appearance.

The overall agreement at the skill level among raters for Interpretation 3 (54%) was less than Interpretation 2 (64%). This is a surprising outcome. A certified expert interpreter would likely have less errors than a less experienced non-certified interpreter

and therefore the rating should be more consistent. Or perhaps, errors are committed but they are more subtle, thus making it difficult to discern them.

Table 15
Rater Agreement on Interpretation 3 across Errors at the Aggregated Rating Level within Each Major Feature

Major Features	No. of errors	No. of errors at least 5 raters agreed	Percent of agreement of at least 5 raters
Fingerspelling	20	20	100
Numbers	19	19	100
Vocabulary	20	19	95
Classifiers/ SASSes	17	17	100
Structuring Space	24	21	88
Grammar	18	16	89
Interpreting	42	39	93
Composure and Appearance	17	17	100
TOTALS	177	168	95

As with the Interpretation 2, this result indicates that the interpretation results are more meaningful if reported at the error level instead of the skill level.

There was much higher overall agreement at the error level on Interpretation 3 (95%) compared to the agreement on Interpretation 2 (77%). This indicates that when assessing an interpretation performed by an expert certified interpreter, there is higher rater

agreement at the error level than when assessing an interpretation performed by a less experienced, non-certified interpreter.

Revisions

Skills, Errors, and Definitions

Using the agreement among raters results and the written and oral comments provided by the seven raters, the instrument was revised as follows. The primary revisions were to clarify the writing and to increase the writing consistency within the skills, errors, and definitions. A total of 174 revisions of this type were made. Table 16 provides a summary of the changes made to the instrument within each Major Feature as a result of Field Test 2.

Table 16
Revisions of Skills, Errors, and Definitions Following Field Test 2

Major Features	Writing Changes	Sequence Changes	Additions	Deletions	Total
Fingerspelling	21	4	3	0	28
Numbers	26	0	0	0	26
Vocabulary	15	0	0	1	16
Classifiers/ SASSes	20	0	0	0	20
Structuring Space	27	0	1	0	28
Grammar	15	0	0	0	15
Interpreting	38	0	0	0	38
Composure and Appearance	12	0	2	0	14
TOTALS	174	4	6	1	185

Four sequence changes were made, all within the Major Feature of Fingerspelling. For two skills, two errors were reversed to correspond with the order of the information presented in the definition of the skill.

Six new errors were added; one error was deleted because it was redundant and did not provide any additional diagnostic information that was not already present elsewhere in the instrument.

Within Rater's Impressions, 4 editorial changes were made to encourage the rater to write clear and specific feedback to the interpreter.

Rating Scale

The rating scale for the skills was altered in several ways. "NT", not in target language message, ASL, was confusing or unclear to five of the raters. Therefore, this was changed to "NA, not applicable, not in the target language, ASL". "Y", "yes" was further operationalized to "Yes, the skill was performed accurately 100% of the time". Similarly, "N", "no", was also operationalized further to "No, the skill was not performed accurately 100% of the time". Only one change was made to the labels used to identify the points on the 5-point scale; "0, no errors present" was changed to "no errors observed".

The Instrument

Within the instrument itself, a 'Reminder Page' was added to remind raters about the rating process. For example, the skill "fingerspelling is accurately used for emphasis" had three errors: 1) eye gaze is inaccurate, 2) rhythm or cadence is inaccurate, and 3) it is overused. Three of the seven raters rated these errors unrelated to the skill but related to the overall fingerspelling demonstrated in the interpretation sample. To avoid this occurring again and to

remind raters about other aspects of rating, four reminder pages were inserted throughout the instrument.

The Table of Contents was changed to enhance the usability of the instrument. Instead of only identifying the page number for each section, the colors of the pages were provided as well, thus, making it easier to locate the appropriate section.

The Cross Reference Index was improved by adding topics to refer raters to the appropriate location in the index. For example, if raters looked up 'space' in the draft used for Field Test 2, they would be unable to locate the page number. In the final draft a topic was added, 'space, see structuring space'. In this way raters could more easily locate specific skills within the instrument without having to look up three of four possible terms. A copy of the revised instrument, the fourth draft, is provided in Appendix F.

The Instruction Manual

Two sections were added to the manual. The first was a brief description of the instrument which was placed after the purpose and goals. Thus, raters could quickly determine whether this tool satisfied their needs. The second section was a description of the person undergoing the assessment, the 'interpreter qualifications'. This section was placed after the description of the rater qualifications.

Some headings within the manual were altered to more clearly describe the content of each section. For example, the section called, 'Assumptions' was changed to 'Assumptions and Prior Conditions' and 'Stimulus' was changed to 'Using and Developing Stimuli'.

The section 'Administration Procedures' was subdivided into several subsections: Amount of Time Required to Rate an Interpretation, Requirements Prior to Rating, and Viewing the Video Tape.

Editorial changes were made as well. In addition to making the writing more clear, the most significant change was changing the term 'evaluatee' to 'interpreter' to more accurately describe the person undergoing the assessment. A copy of the second draft of the manual is provided in Appendix G.

CHAPTER 6: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Purpose of the Study

In many situations, laws in Canada and the United States require the provision of interpreters to allow Deaf people equal access to the community in which they live. Interpreters interpret for Deaf and hearing people in an array of situations, such as an appointment with a doctor or a lawyer, a meeting with a supervisor or employee, or a lecture on prenatal care or on death and dying.

In the United States and Canada, national associations of American Sign Language (ASL)/English interpreters were incorporated in 1972 and 1981, respectively. Not only are national interpreting organizations relatively new, but ASL/English interpreting education is new as well. This being the case, curricula taught in ASL/English interpreting programs are not standardized and are based on the expertise, experience, and knowledge of individual instructors and on individual program philosophies.

Current ASL/English interpreting curricula focus on interpreting in specific settings, for instance, business and industry, medical and mental health, and with specific consumers such as deaf-blind, oral (those who depend on speechreading rather than sign language), and deaf individuals with minimal language competencies. The curricula fail to focus on the identification and acquisition of requisite skills required to render competent ASL/English interpretations. Instead, they focus on acquiring skills and knowledge related to working in various settings and working with various consumers.

In the field of ASL/English interpretation, certification performance examinations are available in Canada and the United States through the Association of Visual Language Interpreters of Canada and the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, respectively. Both of these examinations are proficiency-based and are not diagnostic. Therefore, interpreters taking these examinations only

receive information of their success or failure. No information about interpreters' strengths or weaknesses is provided.

Deaf and hearing consumers and employers of interpreters are in agreement that most graduates of ASL/English interpreting programs lack the necessary skills to interpret competently upon graduation (Disabled Persons Participation Program, 1991). This is confirmed by the observation that interpreters who took the AVLIC performance exam in 1990 had a failure rate of 79%. Interpreters who took the RID performance exam, for ASL/English interpretation, in fiscal year 1990-1991, and received their results, had a failure rate of approximately 54%. Interpreters who took the exam in 1991-1992, and received their results, had a failure rate of approximately 27%.

Both curricula and national certification examinations lack the detailed identification of the skills necessary to perform a competent interpretation of English to ASL. Thus, this research has focused on the identification of skills required to render a competent interpretation, specifically, interpreting from English to ASL. The research included the identification and definition of skills and the development of a diagnostic assessment instrument to assess interpreters with various skill levels and experiences.

Summary of Procedures

A systematic approach to instrument development as outlined by authors Crocker and Algina (1986) was followed to develop the instrument. The first seven of the ten steps outlined by Crocker and Algina (pp. 66-84) were followed. These were: 1) determine the purposes for which the assessment scores derived from the instrument would be used, 2) identify and describe the behaviors indicative of good interpretation practice, 3) create the test specifications and the method of recording observed behaviors, 4) construct the initial pool of items, 5) review the items by a panel of

interpretation experts, 6) field test the instrument using interpreter educators, and 7) analyze the data.

Step 1 to Step 4: Developing the Instrument

The primary purpose of the assessment scores derived from the instrument was to provide interpreters with various levels of skill and experience with a detailed diagnostic assessment of their English-to-ASL interpretation skills.

The instrument was developed by first identifying skills generally seen in English-to-ASL interpretations. Identification was accomplished by reviewing the related literature, both print and video, and conducting observational or task analysis of interpreters with various skill levels and experience. All observations were conducted by the researcher.

Skills were defined as interpretation elements required to provide equivalency of meaning from the source language of English to the target language of ASL. The result was a compilation of skills which detailed the assessment domain of English-to-ASL interpretation. The domain was defined and characterized by including both ASL and interpreting skills because these two competencies were interrelated.

Following the task analysis, skills were clustered into related groupings. Eight groupings or Major Features of interpretation were identified: 1) Numbers, 2) Fingerspelling, 3) Classifiers/SASSes, 4) Vocabulary, 5) Structuring Space, 6) Grammar, 7) Interpreting, and 8) Composure and Appearance. A ninth category, Rater's Judgements, was added to provide the rater with an opportunity to make judgements about the overall performance. The eight Major Features, 'Judgements', and the skills within each feature were sequenced for ease of use by the rater.

To further define the domain, an error analysis was conducted. The analysis yielded a set of relevant and representative errors that might be made by an interpreter for each particular skill. By so

doing, the particular skill, that is, the focal construct, was defined through its list of possible errors.

The result of completing this phase of the research was a first draft diagnostic assessment instrument for English-to-ASL interpretations which was then reviewed by a panel of experts.

Step 5: Panel Review

A national panel of 14 experts from Canada, 8 hearing and 6 Deaf, reviewed the first draft of the instrument. They provided a line-by-line review of the instrument which validated the list of Major Features, the lists of skills within each Major Feature, the lists of possible errors associated with each skill, the sequencing of the skills, and the clarity of the writing.

Following the panel review, the panel members indicated that the instrument filled a necessary gap in assessment methods not currently available for English-to-ASL interpretation. As well, they stated the instrument was comprehensive and had a wide range of possible uses.

Based on the experts' written and oral comments the instrument was revised. Definitions were added to assist in defining each skill more clearly, thereby assisting raters in the rating process.

Step 6: Field Tests

Two field tests were conducted. Sample English-to-ASL interpretations (one novice and one expert) were used in Field Test 1 and Field Test 2. The same novice was used in both field tests. The expert in Field Test 1 was non-certified and in Field Test 2 was replaced with a certified interpreter. These interpreters provided an interpretation on video tape of a predetermined text encompassing a sample of skills from each Major Feature. Using the second and third drafts of the instrument, these samples were then

assessed by expert hearing raters for Field Test 1 and Field Test 2, respectively.

Field Test 1 included two hearing raters from Alberta, Canada. Field Test 2 included seven hearing raters from California, United States. The raters' responsibilities were to validate the definitions, further validate the skills and errors within each Major Feature, and for the first time actually assess interpretation samples using the instrument. The raters in Field Test 2 also conducted a line-by-line review of the rater's instruction manual which was developed after Field Test 1 to explain the instrument and the rating process to potential raters.

The raters conducted their assessments individually, allowing the researcher to observe, most of them, while they assessed the video taped interpretations and to discuss the process upon completion of their assessments. These discussions and observations provided feedback about the instrument and its utility in addition to the raters written comments.

Based on the different ways the raters used the rating scale and following further consultation with them, the rating scale was revised after each field test. Following discussions with the raters used in Field Test 1, a two-tier rating scale was developed. The first was at the skill level with points on the scale to indicate whether the skill was demonstrated, and if it was demonstrated, whether it was accurately or inaccurately executed. At the error level a 4-point scale was developed which included both the frequency and severity of errors within the same scale. Following Field Test 2, the rating scale was kept the same but the definitions were refined to clarify the points on the rating scale.

Based on the written and spoken comments of the raters, the instrument was revised after Field Test 1 and again after Field Test 2, resulting in the fourth draft of the instrument and the second draft of the rater's instruction manual.

Limitations of the Study

The purpose of this study was to develop a diagnostic instrument to assess English-to-ASL interpretations. The small number of experts used in the development of the instrument, the panel review (N=14) and the field studies (N=2 and N=9), is one of the shortcomings of this research. With such small numbers, the generalizability of the study is limited.

Another limitation of the research was using only a single unrehearsed interpretation sample of a five-minute lecture. This type of interpretation sample is limited in terms of its generalizability to the overall competencies of interpreters. It is only one sample of one piece of work and the sample duration is short. Although the first five minutes of any interpretation provides for a fair assessment of the interpretation for that five minutes, it may not reflect a fair assessment of interpreters' overall abilities. That is to say, that during many interpreting experiences, in the first five minutes of work interpreters are not yet familiar with the content of the presentation or the style of the speaker. In longer and/or rehearsed interpretation samples, the interpreter may perform differently.

The instrument was designed for hearing raters to rate the equivalency of the ASL target message to the English source message. This limits the usability of the instrument because the number of hearing raters with the required expertise is small. Using Deaf raters could increase the pool of potential raters; however, they do not have access to the English message in the same way as hearing raters and, therefore, can not rate in the same way. Only hearing raters can use the instrument in its present form.

Step 7: Findings and Conclusions

Based on the findings, preliminary indications suggest that the instrument is usable and that it provides a standardized approach to

assessing interpretations with differing levels of skills from English to ASL. According to the raters, the instrument provides the structure and detail to look for a wide variety of skills and errors. In addition, it provides a method with which to offer feedback to interpreters and can provide consistency in the interpretation field as to the criteria for successful English-to-ASL interpretations.

Preliminary indications suggest that at the macro-level, the skill level, there is low consistency among raters on the rating of the skills. This finding is consistent with Culton's (1981) research on the RID exam when it was a diagnostic examination and had a list of skills rated on a five-point scale. However, at the micro-level or error level, by further defining each skill with its relevant and representative possible errors, the rating consistency among raters significantly increased in Field Test 2 from 64% at the skill level to 77% at the error level for interpretation 2 and from 54% to 95% for interpretation 3.

With respect to the English speech presented on the five-minute audio tape used in the validation process, the raters indicated that the speaker was well-paced and that the length and content of the speech was conducive to viewing samples of interpretation skills in each of the eight Major Features. Thus, the stimulus used for the assessments was appropriate, with no need to change the stimulus tape.

The time required to complete the assessments ranged from 1 hour and 10 minutes to 3 hours and 5 minutes, with an average of about 2 hours. Thus, the assessments were accomplished in a reasonable amount of time indicating the instrument is practical when assessing a 5-minute interpretation sample.

Implications for Practice

The implications for practice are two-fold. First, the lists of identified skills, described by their associated possible errors and definitions, have been agreed upon by Deaf and hearing experts.

These lists of skills can be used by interpreter educators in several ways. For example, educators can compare their current curriculum and the skills they currently teach to those included in this diagnostic assessment instrument. In addition, they can use the identified skills to guide curriculum development within interpreting programs with the possibility of providing standardized skill development across programs in North America.

The second implication for practice is that at this point the diagnostic instrument is ready for its final phase of development. As will be seen in the next section, the instrument must be used in one more trial before it is fully operational. However, every indication thus far demonstrates the instrument is usable and practical. However, before this statement can be made with complete confidence, the final phase of development must be completed. Once this has been done, then the implications for practice can be developed more completely.

Implications for Research

Required Research

The fourth draft of the instrument is ready for a comprehensive field study to further validate its utility. One of the next steps in the continuation of this research is to use raters with varying degrees of experience. The field studies conducted thus far used raters with a minimum of five years of interpreter education experience. The potential pool of raters will increase if raters with less than five years of experience are used. Also a larger number of sample interpretations needs to be used. By increasing the number of samples assessed by a larger number of raters, the generalizability of the results will be enhanced and the instrument will ultimately be improved based on the revisions resulting from the collection of this data.

Along with further validation of the instrument itself, there is a need to ask interpreters undergoing the assessment for their input to be certain it addresses their needs. How should the assessment results be shared with them? For example, should it be done in person or in writing? Can it be done by mail? What information can raters provide to interpreters to assist in their skill development?

Improving the Instrument

Knowledge-Rich Major Features

The Major Features of Grammar and Interpreting are more knowledge-rich and have lower agreement than more knowledge-lean features such as Fingerspelling and Numbers. Can the skills and possible errors in these Major Features be further delineated, and if so, would rater agreement increase?

Instrument's Self-Instructional Qualities

The instrument with its accompanying manual is designed to be self-instructional for the rater. Developing a video tape displaying segments of actual interpretations and discussing the rating procedures would be one way to enhance the self-instructional nature of the instrument.

As the instrument is designed thus far, raters and/or interpreters are responsible for developing activities based on the assessment results that will improve future performance. This relies on the expertise of the individuals to develop an adequate plan for improvement. Another way to enhance the utility of the instrument is to add a component within the instruction manual on specific remedies and activities which address particular weaknesses and that might improve interpreting performance.

Time Required to Rate Interpretations

More research must be conducted to determine the amount of time required to rate interpretations. For example, how long does it take raters with various experience levels to use the instrument and rate interpretations? What is the average length of time required to assess a sample interpretation after rating five or ten interpretations? At what point does a plateau occur? Does rating expert interpretations require less time than rating novice interpretations? If so, what is the impact of this finding on the number of interpretation samples raters can rate within a given period of time?

Increasing the Pool of Raters

The instrument was designed for hearing interpreter educators to compare the message equivalency of the target message, ASL, with the source message, English. ASL is the language of the majority of North American Deaf people and much of the instrument assesses ASL skills, albeit in the context of interpretation. Can Deaf people be used as qualified raters to assess interpretations and increase the pool of potential raters? What qualifications are required? Can they use the instrument in part or in whole? What do they need to conduct the assessment? For example, is it sufficient to use an agreed-upon expert interpretation as a comparison to assess interpretations? If Deaf people are chosen as raters to use the instrument, how might they be different in their rating behaviors?

Developing Similar Instruments

Signed and spoken language interpreters, using different languages from ASL and English, can develop similar instruments using the methodology in this research. The most obvious is a

companion instrument to assess ASL-to-English interpretations. In addition, spoken language interpreters could develop a diagnostic instrument to assess French-to-English or English-to-French interpretations; sign language interpreters can develop an instrument to assess German Sign Language-to-German or German-to-German Sign Language.

Effect on Interpreters Receiving Feedback From Raters

The scope of the study did not include an investigation into the impact of undergoing the assessment on the interpreter and the resulting feedback. Once the assessment is completed, the rater must provide feedback and direction to the interpreter. This was never asked of the raters involved in the field tests; the research stopped short of this. One way to accomplish this is for raters to use the Cross Reference Index in the back of the instrument and examine the rating of the skills appearing in more than one Major Feature. By checking the rating consistency for each of these skills, the rater could develop a plan of action to assist interpreters in developing their skills by pointing out to them their strengths and weaknesses across Major Features. Also, the rater can refer interpreters to resources that will assist them in developing their skills further, such as video tapes, articles, journals, and workshops. What information is the most useful and effective in improving interpreters' skills?

Questions for future research are, for example, once diagnostic information is provided to interpreters, what is the effect? When interpreters are assessed a second time, have they improved?

Key Skills of Novices and Experts

Further research is needed in the area of specific skills which experts demonstrate and the sequence in which they acquire these skills. Several questions need to be addressed. For example, do

particular skills consistently show up in certified interpreters that are not demonstrated by non-certified interpreters? Are there key skills within each Major Feature or within one or two Major Features that will identify expert interpretations? Should some skills be weighted more heavily than others in terms of an overall rating?

Future research can be conducted to determine the sequence of development among interpreters with various years of experience. For example, do interpreters with less than two years of experience display particular errors not exhibited in interpreters with five or more years of experience? What skills do more experienced interpreters display that less experienced interpreters do not? Can the following questions be answered? What skills do interpreters develop first? What skills do interpreters develop last? At what point do the most significant changes in skill level occur? From the answers to these questions a sequence of skill development could be determined with the possibility of enhancing the curricula available to interpreter training programs by determining in what sequence ASL/English interpreting skills should be taught.

References

Anderson, J. R. (1981). Cognitive skills and their acquistion. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Anderson, J. R. (1982). Acquisition of cognitive skills. Psychological Review, 89, 369-406.

Arjona, E. (1984). Education of translators and interpreters. In M. McIntire (Ed.), New Dialogues in Interpreter Training. Proceedings of the Fourth National Conference of Interpreter Trainers Convention (pp. 1-35). Silver Spring, MD: RID Publications.

Baker, C., & Cokely, D. (1980). American Sign Language: A teacher's resource text on grammar and culture. Silver Spring, MD: T. J. Publishers.

Baltes, P. B., Dittmann-Kohli, R., & Dixon, R. A. (1984). New perspectives on the development of intelligence in adulthood: Toward a dual-process conception and a model of selective optimization with compensation. In P. B. Baltes & O. G. Brim, Jr. (Eds.), Life-span development and behavior (Vol 6. pp. 33-76). New York: Academic Press.

Baltes, P. B., & Kliegl, R. (1986). On the dynamics between growth and decline in the aging of intelligence and memory. In K. Poeck (Ed.), Neurology. Proceedings of the XIIIth World Congress of Neurology (pp. 1-17). Heidelberg, West Germany: Springer.

Benner, P. (1984). From novice to expert: Excellence and power in clinical nursing practice. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley.

Berk, R.A. (1986). A consumer's guide to setting performance standards on criterion-referenced tests. Review of Educational Research, 56: 137-172.

Brown, A. L. (1978). Knowing when, where, and how to remember: A problem of metacognition. In R. Glaser (Ed.), Advances in Instructional Psychology (Vol. 1, pp. 77-165). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Brown, A. L. (1982). Learning and development: The problem of compatibility, access, and induction. Human Development, 25, 89-115.

Calderhead, J. (1983, April). Research into teachers' and student teachers' cognitions: Exploring the nature of classroom practice. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Association, Montreal.

Carter, K. C., & Berliner, D. C. (1987, April). Expert and novice interpretations of classroom data. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.

Carter, K., Cushing, K., Sabers, D., Stein, P., & Berliner, D. (1988). Expert-novice differences in perceiving and processing visual information. Journal of Teacher Education, 3, 25-32.

Carter, K., Sabers, D., Cushing, K., Pinnegar, S., & Berliner, D. C. (1987). Processing and using information about students: A study of expert, novice, and postulant teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 3, 147-157.

Charness, N. (1981). Aging and skilled problem solving. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 110, 21-38.

Chase, W. G., & Simon, H. A. (1973a). Perception in chess. Cognitive Psychology, 4, 55-81.

Chase, W.G., & Simon, H.A. (1973b). The mind's eye in chess. In W. G. Chase (Ed.), Visual information processing, (pp. 215-281). New York: Academic Press.

Chi, M. T. H., Feltovich, P., & Glaser, R. (1981). Categorization and representation of physics problems by experts and novices. Cognitive Science, 5, 121-152.

Chi, M. T. H., Glaser, R., & Farr, M. (1988). The nature of expertise. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Chi, M. T. H., Glaser, R., & Rees, E. (1982). Expertise in problem solving. In R. Sternberg (Ed.), Advances in the psychology of human intelligence (pp. 7-76). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cokely, D. (1986). The effects of lag time on interpreter errors. Sign Language Studies, 53, pp. 341-376.

Cokely, D. (1988). The University of New Brunswick Sign Language interpreter training curriculum. St. John, New Brunswick.

Condon, J. C., & Yousef, F. S. (1984). An introduction to intercultural communication. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.

Crocker, L. M. , & Algina, J. (1986). Introduction to classical and modern test theory. New York: CBS College Publishing.

Culton, P. M. (1982). A study of the validity and reliability of the Comprehensive Skills Certificate evaluation for Sign Language interpreters (Doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1981). Dissertation Abstract International, 42, 4765A.

de Groot, A. D. (1965). Thought and choice in chess. The Hague: Mouton.

Denney, N. W. (1984). Aging and cognitive change. In B. B. Wolman (Ed.), Handbook of developmental psychology (pp. 807-827). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Disabled Persons Participation Program. (1991, February). National meeting on training of sign langange interpreters (Minutes). Ottawa, Ontario.

Dreyfus, H. L., Dreyfus, S. E. & Athanasiou, T. (1986.) Mind over machine: The power of human intuition and expertise in the era of the computer. New York: Free Press.

Duda, R. O. (1981). Knowledge-based expert systems come of age. Byte, 6, (9), 238-281.

Emmer, E., Evertson, C., & Anderson, L. (1980). Effective classroom management at the beginning of the school year. Elementary School Journal, 80, 219-231.

Engle, R. W., & Bukstel, L. (1978). Memory processes among bridge players of differing expertise. American Journal of Psychology, 91, 673-689.

Evans, G. (1991, April). Rater reliability: A report of the evaluations committee (research report). The Association of Visual Language Interpreters of Canada.

Evertson, C. M., & Emmer, E. T. (1982). Effective management at the beginning of the year in junior high classes. Jounal of Educational Psychology, 74, 485-498.

Fant, L. (1990). Silver threads: A personal look at the first 25 years of the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf. Silver Spring, MD: Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf.

Frishberg, N. (1986). Interpreting: An introduction. Silver Spring, MD: Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf.

Frishberg, N. (1990). Interpreting: An introduction (rev. ed). Silver Spring, MD: Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf.

Gitomer, D. H., & Glaser, R. (1985). Knowledge, self-regulation and instruction. In R. E. Snow & N. J. Farr (Eds.), Aptitude, learning and instruction (Vol. 3). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Glaser, R. (1987). Thoughts on expertise. In C. Schooler & K. W. Schaie (Eds.), Cognitive functioning and social structure over the life course (pp. 81-94). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Hayakawa, S. I. (1978). Language in thought and action (fourth ed.). Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Hoyer, W. J. (1985). Aging and the development of expert cognition. In T. M. Schlechter & M. P. Toglia (Eds.), New directions in cognitive science (pp. 69-87). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Janzen, T., & Demers, H. (1990). Canadian Evaluation System manual. The Association of Visual Language Interpreters of Canada.

Journal of Interpretation (1979-1986), 1-11. Silver Spring, MD: Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf.

Kliegl, R., & Baltes, P. B. (1987). Theory-guided analysis of mechanisms of development and aging through testing-the-limits and research on expertise. In C. Schooler & K. W. Schaie (Eds.), Cognitive functioning and social structure over the life course (pp. 95-119). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Klima, E., & Bellugi, U. (1979). The signs of language. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Labouvie-Vief, G. (1982). Dynamic development and mature autonomy: A theoretical prologue. Human Development, 25, 161-191.

Labouvie-Vief, G. (1985). Intelligence and cognition. In J. E. Birren & K. W. Schaie (Eds.), Handbook of the psychology of aging (2nd ed., pp. 500-530). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Larkin, J., McDermott, J., Simon, D. P., & Simon, H. A. (1980). Expert and novice performance in solving physics problems. Science, 208, 1335-1342.

Lesgold, A . M. (1984). Acquiring expertise. In J. R. Anderson & S. M. Kosslyn (Eds.), Tutorials in learning and memory: Essays in honor of Gordon Bower, (pp. 31-60). San Francisco: Freeman.

Lesgold, J., McDermott, J., Simon, D. P., & Simon, H. A. (1980). Expert and novice performance in solving physics problems. Science, 208, 1335-1342.

Loveland, E. H. (1976, November). Alternatives and innovations. Paper presented at the National Conference on Evaluating Competence in the Health Professions. New York, NY.

McKee, M. (Dir.). (1980). Devloping curriculum for interpreter training programs in vocational education. Texas State Technical School.

Ministry of Colleges and Universities. (1992, April). Provincial review of visual language interpreting services, intervention services for Deaf-blind persons, and text-based services for Deaf and hard of hearing persons (summary document). Ottawa, Ontario.

Neumann Solow, S. (1981). Sign language interpreting: A basic resource book. Silver Spring, MD: National Association of the Deaf.

Newell, A., & Simon, H. A. (1972). Human problem solving. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Padden, C. (1980). The Deaf community and the culture of Deaf people. In C. Baker & R. Battison (Eds.), Sign Language and the Deaf community: Essays in honor of William C. Stokoe (pp. 89-104). Silver Spring, MD: National Association of the Deaf.

Padden, C., & Humphries, T. (1988). Deaf in America: Voices from a culture. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Patel, V. L., Frederiksen, C. H., & Groen, G. J. (1984). Differences between experts and novices in a complex verbal task in a medical domain (Report No. CME 84-3). Montreal: McGill University, Centre for Medical Education.

Perfetti, C. A., & Lesgold, A.M. (1979). Coding and comprehension in skilled reading. In L.B. Resnick & P. Weaver (Eds.), Theory and practice of early reading, 1, (pp. 57-84). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Per-Lee, M. S. (Ed.). (1981). Interpreter research: Target for the eighties. Conference Report. Washington, DC: National Academy, Gallaudet College.

Pimentel, A. (1979). Introduction. In C. Yoken (Ed.), Interpreter training: The state of the art (pp.1-3). Washington, DC: National Academy, Gallaudet College.

RID Views. (1992). A monthly publication of the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, 9, (10).

Salthouse, T. A. (1985). A theory of cognitive aging. Amsterdam: North Holland.

Schein, J. D., Carver, R., & Mallory, B. (1989) Canadian programs for preparation of visual language interpreters. Edmonton, Alberta: University of Alberta.

Senate passed bill prohibits bias against the disabled: Provisions. (1989). Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report, 47, 2417-2421.

Shimburg, B. (1985). Overview of professional and occupational licensing. In J. C. Fortune & Associates (Eds.), Understanding Testing in Occupational Licensing. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. , 1-14.

Seleskovitch, D. (1978). Interpreting for international conferences: Problems of language and communication. Washington, DC: Pen and Booth.

Sloboda, J. A. (1978). Perception of contour in music reading. Perception, 7, 323-331.

Stokoe, W. (1973). Sign language versus spoken language. Sign Language Studies, 18, pp. 69-90.

Sternberg, M. L. A. (1981). American Sign Language-A comprehensive dictionary. New York: Harper & Row.

Taff-Watson, M., & Northrup, B. E. (Eds.). (1987-1990). Workshop curriculum guides for interpreter trainers. (Vols. 1-4). University of Arkansas at Little Rock: RSA Region VI Interpreter Training Project.

Winefield, R. (1987). Never the twain shall meet-The communications debate. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Woodward, J. (1978). Historical bases of American Sign Language. In P. Siple (Ed.), Understanding language through Sign Language research (pp. 333-348). New York: Academic Press.

Appendix A

Resources Used For Identifying Skills

Alberta Education. (1988, August). The use of an interpreter in an educational setting: Guidelines and standards. Edmonton, Alberta: Education Response Centre.

Anderson, G. B., & Stauffer, L. K. (1990). Identifying standards for the training of interpreters for Deaf people. Little Rock, AR: University of Arkansas, Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Deafness and Hearing Impairment.

Baker, C., & Battison, R. (Eds.). (1980). Sign Language and the Deaf community: Essays in honor of William C. Stokoe. Silver Spring, MD: National Association of the Deaf.

Baker, C., & Cokely, D. (1980). American Sign Language: A teacher's resource text on grammar and culture. Silver Spring, MD: T. J. Publishers.

Baker, C., & Cokely, D. (1981). American Sign Language: A student text units 10-18. Silver Spring, MD: T. J. Publishers.

Baker-Shenk, C. (Ed.). (1990). A model curriculum for teachers of American Sign Language and teachers of ASL/English interpreting. Silver Spring, MD: Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf.

Barnum, M., & Siebert, E. (1987). Interpreting in medical settings: A student manual. Minneapolis/St. Paul: St. Mary's Campus, The College of St. Catherine.

Brown, C. (1989). Deafie's world a personal record: What it means to be Deaf. Fredericton, NB: The University of New Brunswick, Department of Extension and Summer Session.

Caccamise, F., Dirst, R., DeVries, R. D., Heil, J., Kirchner, C., Kirchner, S., Rinaldi, A. M., & Stangarone, J. (Eds.). (1980). Introduction to interpreting for interpreters/translators, hearing impaired consumers, hearing consumers. Silver Spring, MD: Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf.

Caccamise, F., Garretson, M., & Bellugi, U. (Eds.). (1982). Teaching American Sign Language as a second/foreign language. Proceedings of the Third National Symposium on Sign Language Research and Teaching. Silver Spring, MD: National Association of the Deaf.

Caccamise, F., Meath-Lang, B., Mitchell-Caccamise, M., Szurley, C., Bannar, E., Stangarone, J., & Cassell, D. (Eds.). (1982). Profession and practice: The daily challenge. Proceedings of the 1982 RID Seventh Biennial Convention. Silver Spring, MD: Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf.

Cassell, D., Earwood, C., Siple, L., & Wells, J. (1979). Critique manual. Rochester, NY: National Technical Institute for the Deaf, Department of Educational Support Services Training.

Cokely, D. (1984). Editor's comments. The Reflector: A Journal for Sign Language Teachers and Interpreters. 9. Silver Spring, MD: Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf.

Cokely, D. R. (1986). Towards a sociolinguistic model of the interpreting process: Focus on ASL and English (Doctoral dissertation, Georgetown University, 1985). Dissertation Abstract International, 46, 3704A.

Cokely, D. (1988). The University of New Brunswick Sign Language interpreter training curriculum. St. John, New Brunswick.

Cokely, D., & Baker, C. (1981). American Sign Language: A student text units 1-9. Silver Spring, MD: T. J. Publishers.

Cokely, D., & Baker, C. (1981). American Sign Language: A student text units 19-27. Silver Spring, MD: T. J. Publishers.

Conference of Interpreter Trainers (1979, October). Proceedings of the First National Conference. Author.

Conference of Interpreter Trainers (1981, March). Proceedings of the Second National Convention. Author.

Conference of Interpreter Trainers (1982, February). Proceedings of the Third National Convention. Author.

Culton, P. M. (1982). A study of the validity and reliability of the Comprehensive Skills Certificate evaluation for Sign language interpreters (Doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1981). Dissertation Abstract International, 42, 4765A.

Davis, J. E. (1990). Interpreting in a language contact situation: The case of English to ASL interpretation (Doctoral dissertation, University of New Mexico). Dissertation Abstract International, 51, 2003A.

Dinning, D. F. (Ed.). (1988). Papers from the 1988 Conference of the Association of Visual Language Interpreters of Canada. Toronto, Ontario.

Dubienski, B., & Janzen, T. (1987). Task analysis of interpreter skills. Winnipeg, Manitoba: Red River Community College, Interpreter Training Program.

Evans, G. (1991, April). Rater reliability: A report of the evaluations committee (research report). The Association of Visual Language Interpreters of Canada.

Fant, L. (1990). Silver threads: A personal look at the first 25 years of the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf. Silver Spring, MD: Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf.

Fast, J. (1970). Body language. New York: M. Evans and Company.

Frishberg, N. (1986). Interpreting: An introduction. Silver Spring, MD: Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf.

Frishberg, N. (1990). Interpreting: An introduction (rev. ed). Silver Spring, MD: Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf.

Guillory, L. M. (1966). Expressive and receptive fingerspelling for hearing adults. Baton Rouge, Lousiana: Claitor's.

Hoemann, H. W. (1978). Communicating with Deaf People: A Resource Manual for Teachers and Students of American Sign Language. Baltimore, MD: University Park Press.

Humphries, T., Padden, C., & O'Rourke, T. J. (1980). A basic course in American Sign Language. Silver Spring, MD: T. J. Publishers.

Ingram, R. M., & Ingram, B. L. (Eds.). (1975). Hands across the sea. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Interpreting. Washington, DC: Trinity College.

Janzen, T. & Demers, H. (1990). Canadian Evaluation System manual. The Association of Visual Language Interpreters of Canada.

Johnson County Community College. (1984). Interpretation task analysis (draft copy). Overland Park, KS: Author.

Johnson, R. E., Patrie, C. J., & Roy, C. B. (Summer, 1991). Master of Arts in interpreting: Curriculum and evaluation procedure. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University, Department of Linguistics and Interpreting.

Journal of Interpretation (1979-1986), 1-11. Silver Spring, MD: Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf.

Klima, E., & Bellugi, U. (1979). The signs of language. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Knapp, J. E. (1991, May 24). The RID National Testing System technical and operational considerations for the 1990's. Knapp and Associates.

Markowicz, H. (1977). American Sign Language: Fact and fancy. Washington, DC: Gallaudet College, Division of Public Services.

McIntire, M. L. (Ed.). (1984). Education of translators and interpreters: New dialogues in interpreter training. Proceedings of the Fourth National Conference of Interpreter Trainers Convention. Silver Spring, MD: Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf.

McIntire, M. L. (Ed.). (1986). Interpreting: The art of cross cultural mediation. Proceedings of the Ninth National Convention of the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf. Silver Spring, MD: Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf.

McIntire, M. L. (Ed.). (1986). New dimensions in interpreter education: Task analysis-theory and application. Proceedings of the Conference of Interpreter Trainers Fifth National Conference. Silver Spring, MD: Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf.

McIntire, M. L. (Ed.). (1987). New dimensions in interpreter education: curriculum and instruction. Proceedings of the Sixth National Convention: Conference of Interpreter Trainers. Silver Spring, MD: Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf.

McKee, M. (Dir.). (1980). Devloping curriculum for interpreter training programs in vocational education. Texas State Technical School.

Meals, R. A., Payne, W., & Gaines, R. (1988). Functional demands and consequences of manual communication. The Journal of Hand Surgery, 13A, (5) 686-691.

Ministry of Education. (1989). Review of Ontario education programs for Deaf and hard of hearing students. Ottawa, Ontario: Program Implementation and Review Branch.

National Evaluation System Study Committee. (1983). Report of the June 24-26 committee meeting. Silver Spring, MD: Unpublished report from the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf.

Neumann Solow, S. (1981). Sign Language interpreting: A basic resource book. Silver Spring, MD: National Association of the Deaf.

Patrie, C. J. (1990). Fingerspelled word recognition and rapid serial visual processing in hearing adults: A study of expert and novice Sign Language interpreters (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1989). Dissertation Abstracts International, 50, 2038A.

Per-Lee, M. S. (Ed.). (1981). Interpreter research: Target for the eighties. Conference Report. Washington, DC: National Academy, Gallaudet College.

Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf. (1988). Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf National Evaluation System study guide for the written and performance tests. Silver Spring, MD: Author.

Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf. (1983, August). Golden opportunities in interpreting. Proceedings of the Eighth National Convention of the RID. Silver Spring, MD: Author.

Rodda, M., & Grove, C. (1987). Language, cognition and deafness. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Roy, C., & Roy, F. (1981). An introduction to text analysis for interpreters.

Roy, C. B., & Kanda, J. (1979-1981). Deaf interpreter training: Texas State Technical Institute (Books I & II). Commerce, TX: East Texas State University, Occupational Curriculum Laboratory.

Ryall, G., Janzen, T., Shmyr, L., Warren, E., & Services for Hearing Impaired Persons Board of Directors. (1982, Fall). Interpreter skill assessment. Regina, Saskatchewan: Services for Hearing Impaired Persons.

Sacks, O. (1989). Seeing voices: A journey into the world of the Deaf. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Schein, J. D. (1990, August). Facilitating communication for postsecondary students with impaired hearing. Final report to Alberta Advanced Education. Edmonton, Alberta: University of Alberta, Western Canadian Centre of Specialization in Deafness, Department of Educational Psychology.

Schein, J. D., Carver, R., & Mallory, B. (1989) Canadian programs for preparation of visual language interpreters. Edmonton, Alberta: University of Alberta.

Schein, J. D., Mallory, B. L., & Greaves, S. (1991). Communication for Deaf students in mainstreamed classrooms. Edmonton, Alberta: University of Alberta, Western Canadian Centre for Studies in Deafness, Department of Educational Psychology.

Seleskovitch, D. (1978). Interpreting for international conferences: Problems of language and communication. Washington, DC: Pen and Booth.

Sign Language Studies (1976-1990), 10-69. Silver Spring, MD: Linstok Press.

Sprague, J., & Stuart, D. (1988). The speaker's handbook (sec. ed.). Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Stauffer, L., & Reiter Brandwein, D. (Eds.). (1990). Resource guide for interpreter education. Conference of Interpreter Trainers.

Stedt, J. D. (1989, July). Carpal tunnel syndrome: The risk of educational interpreters. American Annals of the Deaf (pp. 223-226).

Sternberg, M. L. A., Tipton, C. C., & Schein J. D. (1973). Curriculum guide for interpreter training. New York: New York University, Deafness Research and Training Center, School of Education.

Stuckless, E. R., Avery, J. C., & Hurwitz, T. A. (Eds.). (1989). Educational interpreting for Deaf students: Report of the National Task Force on Educational Interpreting. Rochester, NY: National Technical Institute for the Deaf.

Taff-Watson, M., & Northrup, B. E. (Eds.). (1987-1990). Workshop curriculum guides for interpreter trainers. (Vols 1-4). University of Arkansas at Little Rock: RSA Region VI Interpreter Training Project.

Wilcox, S. (Ed.). (1989). New dimensions in interpreter education: Evaluation and critique. Proceedings of the Seventh National Convention: Conference of Interpreter Trainers. Conference of Interpreter Trainers.

Woodward, J. (1982). How you gonna get to heaven if you can't talk with Jesus: On depathologizing deafness. Silver Spring, MD: T. J. Publishers.

Yoken, C. (Ed.). (1979). Interpreter training: The state of the art. Washington, DC: The National Academy of Gallaudet College.

Appendix B
Video Tapes With Interpretation Models

Commercially Produced

Interpreter model series: English to ASL. (1985). Burtonsville, Maryland: Sign Media.

Performing arts: Modelling tape 3A. (1989). Salem, OR: Sign Enhancers.

Performing arts: Modelling tape 3B. (1989). Salem, OR: Sign Enhancers.

Taylor, M. M. (Director). (1984). National festival of the arts [Videotape]. Edmonton, Alberta: Grant MacEwan Community College.

Taylor, M. M. (Director) & Chauvet, V. (Speaker). (1986). American Sign Language: Grammatical features [Videotapes 1-10]. Edmonton, Alberta: Grant MacEwan Community College.

Taylor, M. M. (Director). (1990). Workshops for post-secondary interpreters [Videotapes 1-4]. Edmonton, Alberta: Grant MacEwan Community College.

Taylor, M. M. (Director) & Stratiy, A. J. (Speaker). (1987-1988). American Sign Language for interpreters [Videotapes 1-27]. Edmonton, Alberta: Grant MacEwan Community College.

Voice to sign interpretation/transliteration: Modeling tape 2A. (1989). Salem, OR: Sign Enhancers.

Voice to sign interpretation/transliteration: Modeling tape 2B. (1989). Salem, OR: Sign Enhancers.

Voice to sign interpretation/transliteration: Modeling tape 2C. (1989). Salem, OR: Sign Enhancers.

Televised Programs Copied onto Video tape

ABC-Retinitis Pigmentosa Telethon. (1983). California.

CBC-Air Canada Sports Award. (1987). Canada.

CBC-Alberta Newsweek. (1988 - 1989). Edmonton.

CBC-Calgary News. (1987, March). Alberta.

CBC-Edmonton Tornado News. (1987, July). Alberta.

CTV-Winnipeg News. (1987, May). Manitoba.

Deaf Family Magazines. (1987). United States.

Interpreted Religious Program with Jerry Falwell. (1984, September). California.

QCTV-In Touch With Deaf-Blindness. (1989, June 24). Alberta.

Appendix C

Panel Members Qualifications Forms

HEARING EXPERT QUALIFICATIONS

Name: _____
Address: _____
City & Province: _____
Postal Code: _____
Phone (H): _____
Phone (W): _____
DISC: _____
Birthdate: _____

Is ASL the language you learned first? Yes ____ No ____

Is English the language you learned first? Yes ____ No ____

Do you have experience teaching interpreters? Yes ____ No ____
If yes, then
What year did you start teaching interpreters? _____
How many years have you taught interpreters? _____
Do you have experience teaching in an interpreter program?
Yes ___ No ____
Do you have experience teaching employed interpreters?
Yes ___ No ____

What local interpreting organizations do you belong to?
_____

What national interpreting organizations do you belong to?
_____

What national interpreter educator organizations do you belong to?
_____

Do you hold a currently valid interpreter's certification?
Yes ___ No ____
If yes, what certification(s)? _____
Are you currently interpreting? Yes ____ No _____

DEAF EXPERT QUALIFICATIONS

Name: _____
Address: _____
City & Province: _____
Postal Code: _____
Phone (H): _____
Phone (W): _____
DISC: _____
Birthdate: _____

Is ASL your first language? Yes ____ No ____

Is English your first language? Yes ____ No ____

Do you have experience teaching ASL? Yes ____ No ____
If yes, then
What year did you start teaching ASL? _____
How many years have you taught ASL? _____
To whom have you taught ASL?
Adults Yes ____ No ____
Children Yes ____ No ____
Interpreters Yes ____ No ____

What local deaf organizations are you a member of?
_____
_____

What national deaf organizations are you a member of?
_____
_____

How many years have you used interpreters? _____

Have you had experience using new interpreters? Yes ____ No ____

Have you had experience using experienced interpreters? Yes ___ No ___

Appendix D

Forms Used to Provide Consistency in Responses From Experts

MAJOR FEATURES RATING FORM

I agree that all the Major Features needed to assess interpreters are incorporated in this assessment instrument. Yes ___ No ___
If no, then, I would **add** the following Major Features:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

I agree that all the Major Features listed are necessary.
Yes ____ No ____
If no, then, I would recommend **deletion** of the following Major Features:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Please feel free to use the back of this paper to make additional comments which may improve this instrument.

EXPERT RATING FORM

Expert name: _____

Checklist evaluating: _____ Pages: _____

Comprehensiveness of skills

I agree that this checklist of skills is comprehensive.

Yes ____ No ____

If no, then I would **add** the following skills:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Comprehensiveness of skills

I agree that all the skills should be kept in this list.

Yes ____ No ____

If no, then I would **delete** the following skills:

Number Skill

_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____

Expert name: _____

Checklist evaluating: _____ Pages: _____

Comprehensiveness of errors

I agree that the errors in this checklist are comprehensive.

Yes ____ No ____

If no, then I would **add** the following errors:

Number Error

_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____

Comprehensiveness of Errors

I agree all the errors in this checklist should be kept on the list.

Yes ____ No ____

If no, then I would **delete** the following errors:

Number Error

_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____

Sequencing

I agree with the sequencing of this checklist.

Yes ____ No ____

If yes, then,

Essential skills are numbers _____

_____

_____

_____

Desirable skills are numbers _____

_____

_____

_____

If no, then, my sequence is:

Essential skills are numbers _____

_____

_____

_____

Desirable skills are numbers _____

_____

_____

_____

Clarity of writing

I agree that the skills and errors in this checklist are clearly stated.

Yes ____ No ____

If no, then I would recommend the following changes.

Element # Recommended change

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

Appendix E

Audio Tape Transcript

"Spreading Love Around the World"
by Leanne Walls
(Adapted from Looking Out, Looking In
by Ronald B. Adler and Neil Towne, 1990, p. 47[1])

Pages 125 to 127 inclusive have been removed due to copyright restrictions.

[1]Looking Out, Looking In (1990). 6th edition. by Ronald B. Adler, and Neil Towne. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. Orlanda, FLA 32887. p.47

Appendix F

Instrument: Draft 4

TAYLOR'S DIAGNOSTIC INSTRUMENT:

English to American Sign Language Interpretation Assessment

by Marty M. Taylor

Date interpretation was video taped: _____

Video tape number or name: _____

Do you know this interpreter? _____

If yes, in what capacity? _____

Rater name: _____

Rating date: _____

Time started: _____

Numbers of breaks: _____

Length of breaks: _____

Time finished: _____

For research purposes only

June 1993

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MAJOR FEATURES	PAGE	COLOR
FINGERSPELLING	2	Blue
NUMBERS	14	Grey
VOCABULARY	23	Pink
CLASSIFIERS AND SASSes	31	Green
STRUCTURING SPACE	40	Salmon
GRAMMAR	52	Canary
INTERPRETING	61	Cherry
COMPOSURE AND APPEARANCE	78	Lilac
RATER'S IMPRESSIONS	86	Blue
CROSS REFERENCE INDEX	91	Golden Rod

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

FINGERSPELLING

Rating Key

NA	=	Not applicable, not in the target language, ASL
Y	=	Yes, the skill was performed accurately 100% of the time
N	=	No, the skill was not performed accurately 100% of the time

NA	=	Not applicable, not in the target language, ASL
O	=	No errors observed
1	=	Low frequency, low severity
2	=	High frequency, low severity
3	=	Low frequency, high severity
4	=	High frequency , high severity

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

FINGERSPELLING

1. DEF: If the word is misspelled or if there are missing or added letters, the word is spelled inaccurately. Also, if the wrong word is spelled such as C-A-B-B-A-G-E for the English word 'cottage', it is an error.

2. DEF: Acronyms are signed in several different ways. A slight pause between letters with a slight circular movement indicates the signing of initials. If acronyms are commonly used, they are spelled as if they are words instead of individual letters (e.g. C-S-U-N for California State University, Northridge) assuming the addressee is equally familiar with the acronym as the interpreter. When the speaker says the entire name such as Grant MacEwan Community College and the addressee is familiar with this institution, then the formation of G-M-C-C would be made with a pause between letters and small circular motions with each letter indicating the speaker mentioned the words of the college, not just the initials. Another example that might be initialized locally but not nationally, is the local service agency providing interpreters for deaf and hearing people.

3. DEF: Omissions are considered errors. Words that should be spelled should not be deleted. These omissions can occur for a variety of reasons such as when the interpreter is not familiar with the information (e.g. names) or the information is too fast to keep up. For example, assuming name signs are not already established, if people are introducing themselves, their names should be spelled. All of the information present in the source message should be in the target message. There should be no deletions.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

FINGERSPELLING

1. Words are fingerspelled accurately .....NA Y N

Error

1.A Words are fingerspelled inaccurately (e.g. misspelled words, letters are missing such as P-I-N...P-L-E for pineapple .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

2. Acronyms are formed accurately (e.g. G.U.A.A., A.V.L.I.C.).....NA Y N

Error

2.A Acronyms are formed inaccurately .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

3. Words that should be spelled are present .....NA Y N

Error

3.A Words are deleted .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

4. DEF: Proper names (e.g. titles of films and books) should be spelled unless previously agreed-upon signs exist. Proper nouns include regional variations; therefore, what is an accurate sign in one location may not be accurate in another. For example, if interpreting in Canada, the city of Winnipeg is most often signed, but if interpreting in the United States, Winnipeg would probably be spelled assuming the addressee is not familiar with the signs for Canadian cities such as Winnipeg. At times speed of the speaker becomes a problem and is evident in the interpretation when words that should be spelled are signed instead, hoping to save time in the interpretation. When this occurs it is an error. Another interpretation phenomenon is splitting an English word, that is, for example, spelling half of the word and signing the other half as in 'happiness' when it is signed HAPPY + N-E-S-S. Again this is not accurate. The entire word should either be signed or spelled but not a mixture of both.

5. DEF: Fingerspelling can be used for both importance and emphasis (e.g. W-O-N-T), however it should not be overused, meaning it is used so often as to lose its impact, unless of course this is the intent of the speaker. The spelling should be noticeably different from other parts of the interpretation often with strong precise movements from one letter to the next with the eye gaze directed either toward the addressee or the hand.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

4. Accurately chooses to fingerspell those words which should be spelled and signs those concepts which should be signed .....NA Y N

Errors

4.A Spells words that should be signed (e.g. relies excessively on spelling) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

4.B Signs words that should be spelled (e.g. signs instead of spells C-A-N-A-D-I-A-N pause A-I-R-L-I-N-E-S) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

5. Fingerspelling is used for emphasis accurately .....NA Y N

Errors

5.A Eye gaze is inaccurate .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

5.B Rhythm or cadence is inaccurate .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

5.C Fingerspelling with emphasis is overused .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

6. DEF: Letters should be formed with an even pace or pause between each letter, including double letters, such as B-B and O-O. Pauses between the words are longer in duration than those between letters. If the words are spelled without pauses or the pauses appear at uneven intervals, the rhythm is inaccurate.

7. DEF: If the spelling is clear, the movement is complete and each individual letter is formed. For example, in the fingerspelled word L-A-M-B there should be no extra letters present as in L-A-C-M-B. The individual letters are unclear, if it is difficult to comprehend the spelling.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

6. The spelling rhythm is uniform within and between words .....NA Y N

Errors

6.A The pauses between words are not present (e.g. L-I-T-T-L-E-H-O-U-S-E-O-N-T-H-E-P-R-A-I-R-I-E) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

6.B The pauses between words are uneven (e.g. L-I-T-T-L-E-pause pause pause H-O-U-S-E-O-N-T-H-E pause -P-R-A-I-R-I-E) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

6.C The pauses within words are uneven (e.g. F-R-A-N-pause K-L-I-N).....NA 0 1 2 3 4

7. Individual letters are clearly presented .....NA Y N

Error

7.A The individual letters are unclear (e.g. sloppy, tense, cramped) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

8. DEF: The hand should be held in a visually comfortable position with the arm bent and the hand slightly in front of the shoulder area, not the face. The arm should not be regularly extended away from the body toward the addressee. When fingerspelling, the hand should either remain stationary or move slightly outward from the shoulder area of the body for both left and right interpreters. It is inaccurate to regularly fingerspell outward to inward. The arm should not move upward (e.g. spelling above the shoulder) or downward (e.g. down near the waist). The movement of the hand should not jump or twist. The palm of the hand or the profile of the hand (especially to prevent repetitive motion injuries), not the back of the hand, should be directed toward the addressee.

9. Def: The speed of spelling is highly dependent on the addressee's skill and/or preference. If the deaf consumer is a native or near native signer the speed of the spelling is less important. Slow fingerspelling can annoy the consumer or appear patronizing. Slow fingerspelling may be used accurately when importance or emphasis is shown. In this case it is accurate to fingerspell slowly. Fast fingerspelling is acceptable if it is readable. If novel information is conveyed using the same fingerspelling rate as words that are familiar and commonly used, this would be considered too fast.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

8. The hand is stationary and in an appropriate location .....NA Y N

Errors

8.A Excessive vertical movements are present .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

8.B Excessive horizontal movements are present .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

8.C Extraneous movements are present (e.g. bounces, twists wrist excessively) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

8.D Palm orientation is directed toward the interpreter .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

8.E The location of the spelling is intrusive (e.g. hand in front of face or down at waist) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

9. Words are spelled at an understandable speed .....NA Y N

Errors

9.A Words are spelled too fast .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

9.B Words are spelled distractingly slow .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

10. Def: The presence or absence of mouthing is a personal preference of deaf consumers. It may or may not be an error. Because fingerspelling is a way to borrow from English, it is permissible to mouth the words spelled. However, if individual letters instead of words are mouthed or excessive mouthing is used (e.g. unnatural mouthing), it is an error. If mouthing is present, the entire word, not individual letters, should be mouthed and mouthed naturally. Mouthing should also coincide with the spelling of the word and occur simultaneously if it is done. In other words the mouthing should not occur before or after the spelling.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

10. Mouthing of fingerspelled words is appropriate .....NA Y N

Errors

10.A Mouthing is not present when it should be (e.g. mouth is closed) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

10.B Mouthing of individuals letters instead of words .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

10.C Excessive mouthing is present (e.g. distracting tongue thrusts) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

10.D Mouthing is done at a different time from the spelling (e.g. before or after the words are spelled) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

REMINDERS

-Be sure to refer to the work or the interpretation, not the interpreter, when writing comments. Avoid using 'you', for example, "you signed..." or "your interpretation..." Instead use "the interpretation demonstrated signs that..." or the "interpretation was..."

-Be sure to write both positive and negative comments when providing feedback about the interpretation.

-View the tape at least twice without sound.

-Be sure to rate every skill and every error.

-If the skill is not present, then it is marked NA, not applicable, and all of the errors related to this skill are also marked NA.

-Remember to rate the errors associated with the skill it defines only. The errors should not be rated as if they were associated with other skills For example, the error 5.B "rhythm or cadence is inaccurate" should be rated in association with skill 5. "Fingerspelling is used for emphasis accurately". It should not be rated for overall rhythm or cadence of the fingerspelling in the interpretation.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

NUMBERS

Rating Key

NA	=	Not applicable, not in the target language, ASL
Y	=	Yes, the skill was performed accurately 100% of the time
N	=	No, the skill was not performed accurately 100% of the time

NA	=	Not applicable, not in the target language, ASL
O	=	No errors observed
1	=	Low frequency, low severity
2	=	High frequency, low severity
3	=	Low frequency, high severity
4	=	High frequency , high severity

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

NUMBERS

11. DEF: Numbers are precise elements of information. There is often a lack of context in which to remember the information, therefore, often numbers can be either incorrect or deleted. Skill #11 addresses the number only. Is the English 32 and the ASL TWENTY-THREE? If yes, then it is inaccurate. If the numbers are deleted then 11.A should be rated 'NA', not applicable.

12. DEF: ASL has a variety of numbering systems. For example, cardinal (e.g. 7 balls) and ordinal numbers (e.g. first in line) are signed differently from one another, as are numbers associated with height and scores in sports. In order for the interpretation of the numbering system to be accurate, the palm orientation must be accurate. For example, the signing of a telephone number, 555-2547, should all be signed with the palm toward the addressee. Twisting from palm out to palm in should not occur. The movement should be accurate for each number and numbering system. If talking about the 5-3 baseball score, the movement, assuming the speaker is not supporting either team should be from the passive to the dominant side and in this case the palm should be facing the interpreter. Finally, the location of the number must be accurate. If the number discussed is player number 11, often it is signed on the chest or the upper arm of the passive side, and not signed in neutral space.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

NUMBERS

11. Numbers are signed accurately .....NA Y N

Errors

11.A Numbers are signed inaccurately (e.g. 17 instead of 16) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

11.B Numbers are deleted .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

12. Numbering systems are used accurately .....NA Y N

Errors

12.A Numbering systems are inaccurate (e.g. ONCE instead of FIRST, FIFTEEN + HUNDRED instead of ONE-THOUSAND-FIVE-HUNDRED) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

12.B The palm orientation is inaccurate (e.g. height 5' 6" is signed with palm out instead of palm in) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

12.C The movements are inaccurate (e.g. 1991 moves inward toward mid-line of body instead of from mid-line outward) ....NA 0 1 2 3 4

12.D The locations of the numbers are inaccurate (e.g. a person taller than the signer is 7' tall and the sign is made at chest level instead of above the head) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

13. DEF: Numbers are often incorporated with signs. Rather than following the English form and signing TWO + THEM + GO-TO (double index fingers) + STORE, both the pronoun and the verb can be altered to provide the same meaning such as THOSE-TWO + GO-TO (using the number two moving in the direction of the store) + STORE. This latter example uses the number incorporation feature of ASL, which is different from the linearity of English. Numbers dealing with money, the calendar, age and time/o'clock also use the incorporation of numbers. Rather than signing FIVE + DOLLARS it is signed FIVE-DOLLARS. FOUR + WEEKS + AGO is combined into one sign FOUR-WEEKS-AGO.

14. DEF: Non-specific number signs are those signs which indicate a number more than one without stating an exact amount such as five or eighteen. The general number of how many people or things involved in the utterance (e.g. many or few) should be accurately interpreted.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

13. Incorporation of numbers is accurate .....NA Y N

Errors

13.A Does not incorporate numbers in pronouns (e.g. WE + TWO instead of WE-TWO) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

13.B Does not incorporate numbers in verbs (e.g. WE-TWO-GO-TO + STORE) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

13.C Money/currency is signed inaccurately (e.g. FIVE-CENT) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

13.D Calendar events are signed inaccurately (e.g. THREE-WEEKS) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

13.E Age is signed inaccurately (e.g. AGE-FIVE) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

13.F Time/o'clock is signed inaccurately (e.g. TIME-EIGHT, FIVE-MINUTES) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

14. Non-specific number signs are accurate (e.g. FEW, MANY) .....NA Y N

Error

14.A Non-specific number signs are inaccurate (e.g. FEW instead of SEVERAL) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

15. DEF: The numbers are unclear if they are not readable or difficult to read. If numbers are clear, movements are complete with no extraneous movements present. There should be no visible bouncing or 'stuttering'. Numbers should flow clearly from one number to the next. For example, number 79 should not move from SEVEN to FIVE to NINE. It should move directly from the number SEVEN to NINE.

16. DEF: Numbers are formed with an even rhythm. Pauses can be used within a series of numbers but these should be equal in duration and follow the rules of the appropriate numbering system. The pauses should have equal lengths of time between them. If there are unequal pauses within or between numbers it can skew the information. Pauses between series of numbers are longer in duration than pauses within a series of numbers. For example, when discussing the height of two children, 4' 6" and 5' 0", there should be a pause between the two heights. It is inaccurate to have equal pauses between all four numbers.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

15. Numbers are clearly presented .....NA Y N

Errors

15.A Numbers are not readable .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

15.B Extraneous movements are present .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

16. The pace is uniform within and between numbers .....NA Y N

Errors

16.A Pauses between series of numbers are not present, thus appearing to be all one number (e.g. EIGHT-FOUR-EIGHTEEN instead of EIGHT-pause-FOUR-pause-EIGHTEEN) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

16.B Pauses in the middle of numbers are inaccurate (e.g. ONE-HUNDRED-pause-NINE-FORTY, thus appearing to be two separate numbers) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

17. DEF: The interpreter's signing speed of numbers should depend on the addressee's skill and/or preference. If the deaf consumer is a native or near-native signer, the speed of execution is less important. Fast production of numbers is acceptable if it is readable. If novel information is conveyed using the same rate of speed that is used with familiar and commonly used numbers, this would be considered too fast. Slow signing can annoy consumers or appear patronizing. Signing numbers slowly is appropriate when importance or emphasis is shown. For example, if a person owes a debt of $437.00, this is important as compared to the government's debt of $55,700,000 (unless of course, you are talking to the treasurer, then this becomes important).

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

17. Numbers are signed at a readable speed .....NA Y N

Errors

17.A Numbers are signed too fast .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

17.B Numbers are signed distractingly slow .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

VOCABULARY

Rating Key

NA	=	Not applicable, not in the target language, ASL
Y	=	Yes, the skill was performed accurately 100% of the time
N	=	No, the skill was not performed accurately 100% of the time

NA	=	Not applicable, not in the target language, ASL	
O	=	No errors observed	
1	=	Low frequency,	low severity
2	=	High frequency,	low severity
3	=	Low frequency,	high severity
4	=	High frequency ,	high severity

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

VOCABULARY

18. DEF: The focus of this item is to convey the meaning of the utterance with accurate vocabulary choices. The signs chosen must match the meaning (semantics) between the source and target languages. For example, in English the word 'disappeared' is used in a variety of ways, such as, "My purse disappeared" and "You disappeared after class." In ASL these two meanings of 'disappear' are signed differently. The nonmanual grammar must agree with the message. Compound signs are not signed as if they are two different signs but instead a sign with two movements and two handshapes done in rapid succession. Fingerspelled loan signs are signs that have evolved from fingerspelling. For accurate execution they have specific movements, handshapes and locations, for example, BACK and STYLE. Also, noun-verb pairs are signed differently from one another. Nouns in this category are signed with a static repeated movement while verbs are signed with a smooth often singular movement. Initialized signs are signs indicating the first initial of the English word used by the speaker during the production of the sign. When providing an ASL interpretation it is inaccurate to use such signs, unless, the deaf consumer and the interpreter have previously agreed upon them. Typically, signs from any English sign system should not be used. Also when signing in English, not ASL, the signed message can have English word endings such as -ing, -ed, -ment. These are not accurate in ASL.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

VOCABULARY

18. ASL vocabulary (lexicon) is accurate .....NA Y N

Errors

18.A Semantics are inaccurate (e.g. 'USE' as opposed to 'USED-TO') .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

18.B Nonmanual facial grammar is inaccurate .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

18.C Compound signs are signed inaccurately (e.g. BLACK-NAME) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

18.D Loan signs are signed inaccurately .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

18.E Noun-verb pairs are inaccurate (AIRPLANE and FLY, CHAIR and SIT) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

18.F Initialized signs are used (e.g. IS, SOCIETY with 'S' handshapes like CLASS) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

18.G English endings are used (e.g. -ed, -ing, -ment) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

19. DEF: Signs must be clearly formed for ease of understanding. The handshape and movement of the signs must be accurate. If they are unclear or cause confusion they are inaccurate. The position of the sign should be in an accurate location. For example, in a formal setting, the signs that belong on the forehead (e.g. KNOW) should occur there. Location, handshape, movement, and *palm orientation should be accurate. It is deemed inaccurate when any potential for misunderstanding occurs. Signs should be signed completely without slurring, that is, signing one sign to the next without definition between the signs, thus appearing to be all one. Extraneous movements, such as excessive bouncing or repetition of the sign, should not occur. The signs must be easily understood and accurate nonmanual facial grammar should accompany the signs. If signs are two-handed, two hands should be used instead of one unless this modification agrees with the speaker's message.

*Note: At the time of printing, the issue of palm orientation was controversial.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

19. Signs are formed accurately .....NA Y N

Errors

19.A Handshapes of the signs are inaccurate (e.g. THEY instead of THEIR) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

19.B Movements of the signs are inaccurate (e.g. signing WORK with the movement of BUSY) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

19.C Locations of the signs are inaccurate (e.g. DOCTOR signed on the back of the wrist could be confused with DUTY) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

19.D Palm orientations of the signs are inaccurate (LAY-ON-BACK instead of LAY-ON-STOMACH) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

19.E Signs are not formed completely .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

19.F Extraneous movements within signs are present .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

19.G Nonmanual facial grammar is inaccurate .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

19.H Two-handed signs are signed with only one hand (e.g. HAVE) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

20. DEF: Although ASL vocabulary is not as diverse as English vocabulary, the interpretation should attempt to be as diverse as the English speaker. The message should not be repetitive unless the speaker is repetitive.

21. DEF: ASL is an evolving language. The interpretation should reflect this evolution and match the needs of the addressee. Vocabulary is ever changing in both English and ASL. World events affect the language, for example, wars (Persian Gulf War), newly elected public officials, and technology (microwaves, computers, satellite dishes). New terminology is incorporated in the languages and should be reflected in the interpretation. The ASL vocabulary should match the age of the addressee as well as the region the addressee is from. For example, if the addressee is from Vancouver and visiting Halifax for a meeting, the interpretation should not include local name signs of people and places, unless the addressee is already familiar with them. They should only be used after the meaning of the name signs are clearly identified.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

20. A diverse range of ASL vocabulary is used .....NA Y N

Errors

20.A ASL vocabulary is limited .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

20.B ASL vocabulary is repetitive (e.g. FINISH, WOW, TRUE) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

21. Vocabulary appropriate to the setting and the consumer is used (e.g. MICROWAVE, a newly elected prime minister) .....NA Y N

Errors

21.A The vocabulary is not appropriate for the age of the consumer .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

21.B Regional vocabulary is used inaccurately (e.g. signing Edmonton Eskimos, a football team, as Eskimos in Edmonton) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

REMINDERS

-Be sure to refer to the work or the interpretation, not the interpreter, when writing comments. Avoid using 'you', for example, "you signed..." or "your interpretation..." Instead use "the interpretation demonstrated signs that..." or the "interpretation was..."

-Be sure to write both positive and negative comments when providing feedback about the interpretation.

-View the tape at least twice without sound.

-Be sure to rate every skill and every error.

-If the skill is not present, then it is marked NA, not applicable, and all of the errors related to this skill are also marked NA.

-Remember to rate the errors associated with the skill it defines only. The errors should not be rated as if they were associated with other skills For example, the error 5.B "rhythm or cadence is inaccurate" should be rated in association with skill 5. "Fingerspelling is used for emphasis accurately". It should not be rated for overall rhythm or cadence of the fingerspelling in the interpretation.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

CLASSIFIERS AND SASSes

Rating Key

NA	=	Not applicable, not in the target language, ASL
Y	=	Yes, the skill was performed accurately 100% of the time
N	=	No, the skill was not performed accurately 100% of the time

NA	=	Not applicable, not in the target language, ASL	
O	=	No errors observed	
1	=	Low frequency,	low severity
2	=	High frequency,	low severity
3	=	Low frequency,	high severity
4	=	High frequency ,	high severity

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

CLASSIFIERS AND SASSes

22. DEF: Classifiers can be used as pronouns and verbs. They are an integral part of ASL and, depending on the information, should be used in the interpretation. Accurate nonmanual facial grammar should be used. If it is not present the target language is inaccurate. Classifiers should have both accurate handshapes and accurate nonmanual grammatical features.

23. DEF: SASSes are size and shape specifiers. They visually display the size, shape, depth and/or texture of an object or location. To provide precise information, SASSes must be used and used accurately. For example, if the utterance is about the buttons on a blouse, an F-HAND would likely be accurate rather than an O-HAND that would indicate holes in the blouse or the body, not buttons. Also in many instances, nonmanual grammatical features must be present. If they are not present then there is an error.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

CLASSIFIERS AND SASSes

22. Classifiers are used accurately .....NA Y N

Errors

22.A Handshapes used for classifiers are inaccurate (e.g. CLASSIFIER-INDEX instead of CLASSIFIER-FLAT-HAND) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

22.B Nonmanual facial grammar is inaccurate .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

23. SASSes (size and shape specifiers) are used inaccurately .....NA Y N

Errors

23.A Handshapes used for SASSes are inaccurate (e.g. F-HAND instead of O-HAND) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

23.B Nonmanual facial grammar is inaccurate .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

24. DEF: Classifiers identify the spatial location of a particular person or thing. That is, they can function as verbs and locatives. If the classifier moves it must move accurately. The classifier should clearly indicate the location and movement of the person or thing, such as if the persons or things are sitting in rows, a semi-circle, or haphazardly moving about.

At times, an interpretation is accurate when just one classifier is used but becomes inaccurate when more than one classifier is used. The ideal interpretation accurately conveys meaning using one or several classifiers. For example, the spatial relationship of the person, car and animal should be accurate when signing CLASSIFIER-PERSON, CLASSIFIER-VEHICLE, CLASSIFIER-ANIMAL.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

24. Classifiers are structurally accurate .....NA Y N

Errors

24.A Classifiers are structurally inaccurate (e.g. when a log or pencil is close, using the same CLASSIFIER-INDEX rather than CLASSIFIER-INDEX using the forearm with the index finger) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

24.B The action of the verb incorporated with the classifier is inaccurate (e.g. C-A-R + CLASSIFIER-VEHICLE + DRIVE-DOWN-INCLINE instead of C-A-R + CLASSIFIER-VEHICLE-DRIVE-DOWN-INCLINE) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

24.C Inaccurately identifies spatial locations using classifiers (e.g. lined up in rows haphazardly) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

24.D When more than one classifier is used, the relationships are inaccurate (e.g. One hand is not held constant while signing the relationship of each topic or action.) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

25. DEF: Classifiers are an important part of ASL. In many interpretations classifiers should be present in the target message. Because ASL is a visual language and classifiers are a visual way to represent information and events, they should be used as much as possible. It can be tempting to sign many signs for a particular message (linear representation), but if it can be expressed using classifiers, then it should be done this way. If the interpretation does not take advantage of the spatial properties of ASL, it leaves the 'interpretation' up to the deaf person.

26. DEF: Pictorial outlining is a specific way that SASSes can be used. It is a method of signing that shows the shape or outline of something. It conveys information and provides specific visual meaning. Often it is used in conjunction with classifiers and SASSes. The size and shape of the object must be accurate. For example, if describing the shape of Vancouver Island, one might choose to outline the shape of the island. If one does not know the shape of the island it can not be done accurately unless the details of the shape are present in the source language. When the shape of something is symmetrical, both hands should move in the same manner simultaneously.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

25. Classifiers are used extensively .....NA Y N

Error

25.A Individual signs are used instead of classifiers (e.g. CAR + HIT + MAN instead of MAN + CLASSIFIER-INDEX + C-A-R + CLASSIFIER-VEHICLE-HIT-CLASSIFIER-INDEX) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

25.B Few classifiers are used in comparison to what could be used .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

26. Pictorial outlining is accurate .....NA Y N

Errors

26.A Sizes are inaccurate (e.g. a postage stamp instead of a 3X5 card) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

26.B Shapes are inaccurate .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

26.C One finger is not held constant while the other finger is outlining an unusual shape .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

26.D Inaccurate when both hands should move simultaneously and don't (e.g. OUTLINE-CARD, both hands should move simultaneously, not consecutively) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

27. DEF: Because classifiers often function as pronouns, the referent noun needs to be identified prior to using a classifier. It is inaccurate to sign a classifier without first identifying what the classifier represents. By establishing the noun first, the addressee knows what the pronoun refers to. Without this prior knowledge the pronoun is just that, a pronoun without a referent, and is therefore inaccurate.

28. DEF: SASSes are a description of something. Before the description is rendered the interpretation must identify the referent noun or the pronoun before describing it. For example, if a person is talking about the waves on the lake, the lake must be identified prior to describing the waves using SASSes.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

27. The noun is identified prior to using a classifier (e.g. pencil then classifier) .....NA Y N

Errors

27.A The noun is identified after using a classifier (e.g. CLASSIFIER-INDEX + PENCIL) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

27.B The noun is not identified at all (e.g. CLASSIFIER-VEHICLE + BREAKDOWN without indicating what vehicle) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

28. SASSes are signed after the noun or pronoun (e.g. T-U-B-E + F-HANDSHAPE-THIN-LONG) .....NA Y N

Error

28.A SASSes are signed before the noun or pronoun is identified (e.g. THIN-LONG + T-U-B-E instead of T-U-B-E first) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

STRUCTURING SPACE

Rating Key

NA	=	Not applicable, not in the target language, ASL
Y	=	Yes, the skill was performed accurately 100% of the time
N	=	No, the skill was not performed accurately 100% of the time

NA	=	Not applicable, not in the target language, ASL	
O	=	No errors observed	
1	=	Low frequency,	low severity
2	=	High frequency,	low severity
3	=	Low frequency,	high severity
4	=	High frequency ,	high severity

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

STRUCTURING SPACE

29. DEF: The spatial relationship must be accurate when more than one person, place or thing is mentioned. For example, "Paul, who is 38, and Mark, who is 36, live in Washington State" could be signed with the name of each person in a different location and the corresponding age signed in locations corresponding to each man. Structuring space should be accurate in relation to the actual location of people, places or things referred to in the utterance. For example, if Joe is on the left and George on the right and both are present in the room, their actual spatial location is used to identify them. In ASL if there are actual situations, people, or places discussed, these locations are established corresponding to real life. If talking about cities in Canada and the United States, Helena, Montana should be 'below' Calgary and Edmonton, Alberta. Edmonton should be above Calgary. They should all be equal distance from one another to agree with their relative geographic relationship.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

STRUCTURING SPACE

29. Structuring space is accurate .....NA Y N

Errors

29.A Spatial relationships are inaccurate (e.g. 'They stood in opposite corners of the room', is signed with both in the same corner) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

29.B Spatial agreement is inaccurate (e.g. 'Eva goes to preschool daily' is signed with GO-TO moving to a different location from where the preschool was established) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

29.C The actual location of people or things is not followed (e.g. Sheree and Kathy are sitting in the room and the pointing is directed to a spatial location different from where they are sitting) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

29.D Inaccurately uses space for places/geography (e.g. Washington State should be to the left and New York to the right of the interpreter) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

30. DEF: When the speaker is talking about people interacting with one another, the interpretation should reflect this. The most basic interaction is that of the narrator (the person talking) and one other person. The first person, that is the speaker, addresses the second person, the person spoken to. The body orientation, including the head and shoulders, must have the accurate orientation. If Joe is tall and looking down at his toddler on the floor, then he should be looking down when he addresses his toddler. The toddler should look up in the direction of where Joe is located in space. The subject can be indicated by "becoming" a person using eye gaze (e.g. left, right, up, down), body shifts, facial expressions, and mannerisms of that person, then back to narrator or speaker by looking at the addressee and resuming a neutral position. If the conversation is lengthy, the interpretation should not include repetition of "FATHER + SAY" and the "TODDLER + SAY". This repetition in English is acceptable. In ASL, this repetition is perceived as redundant.

When two people are talking or several issues are discussed, the interpretation must clearly indicate who is talking to whom and what issues are being discussed by whom. Also, it must be accurately conveyed when the speaker assumes the role of narrator speaking to the addressee or the audience.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

30. Assuming the role of characters and/or ideas is accurate .....NA Y N

Errors

30.A Body orientation for characters or ideas is inaccurate (e.g. small boy talking to his tall father or a comparison between Italian and French food) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

30.B Assumes the role of persons other than the narrator inaccurately (e.g. it is not clear who is talking to whom) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

30.C Assumes the role of narrator inaccurately (e.g. doesn't address the addressee as a narrator) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

30.D Indicates the name of the person or idea redundantly (e.g. repeatedly signing HE + SAID and SHE + SAID) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

31. DEF: Once locations are assigned in space they should be held constant. They should not be misplaced or altered without signaling that restructuring is occurred. Restructuring is perfectly acceptable. However, it must be accurately executed with a clear indication in the interpretation that there is a change in spatial location. A new referent can not be placed in the location of a previously established referent without first indicating this change. If the change is not indicated, misunderstanding can result.

32. If signs are used without structuring space, this is an error. For example, the advantages and disadvantages of parents paying for their child's education can be signed in several ways. One alternative is to sign the advantages near the left side of the body and the disadvantages near the right side of the body. Another way is to sign exactly what is stated without setting up spatial locations for the advantages and disadvantages. This latter manner of interpretation does not take advantage of ASL's spatial properties. Individual signs are used instead of structuring space, that is, strings of signs are presented rather than manipulating space.

Space should be used extensively and with ease. Use of the passive hand, can demonstrate the ease with which space is structured. Both the active and passive hands should be used throughout the interpretation.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

31. Structure of space is held constant .....NA Y N

Errors

31.A Locations of people or things are changed or misplaced inaccurately (e.g. Katherine was on the left and is placed on the right inaccurately) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

31.B Restructuring space is inaccurate (e.g. When a new topic is discussed, it is not clear that newly assigned spatial locations are used) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

31.C Assigning two different referents to the same location (e.g. the car and the bus) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

32. Space is used extensively .....NA Y N

Errors

32.A Individual signs are used instead of structuring space .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

32.B Passive hand is used for structuring space inaccurately .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

33. DEF: Not only are people, places and things placed in space; verbs are manipulated in space and must agree with previously assigned locations. If the location for Joe is on the right side of the interpreter's space and someone gives something to him, the movement of the verb should move toward the right side where Joe is established. If it moves away from Joe, it gives the wrong meaning.

Body-anchored verbs are a type of verb that uses space. In this case, as the name implies, the signs are made on the body. Examples of this are SURGERY and HIT. If possible, these verbs should be articulated at the site of the area discussed, for example, the left eye, or the index finger on the right hand.

In addition to placing things and people in space and signing on the body at the right location, nonmanuals associated with the verb should be used accurately. For example, often the eyes should follow the movement of the verb. For example, if the operation is on the back of the arm, the eyes often glance or look at this area of the body.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

33. Signs verbs by modulating the use of space accurately (e.g. She gave the money to them) .....NA Y N

Errors

33.A The verb is modulated to show location inaccurately (e.g. GO-TO-LEFT should be GO-TO-RIGHT) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

33.B Directional verbs showing subject-object relationships are inaccurate (e.g. ME-BORROW moving toward the addressee instead of toward the interpreter) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

33.C Verbs which can be signed on specific body locations are inaccurate (e.g. body-anchored verbs such as SHAVE-ON-HEAD, HURT-AT-EAR)..... NA 0 1 2 3 4

33.D Adverbial nonmanual facial grammar is inaccurate (e.g. 'STA' and 'MM') .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

34. DEF: All languages, including ASL, have methods for articulating pronominalization; who is saying what to whom and who is doing what to whom.

When a referent is moved from one location to another it should be done accurately and should indicate from where and to where the referent is moved. If the speaker's perspective changes the referent may change locations; it may move closer or farther away. The target language should clearly indicate whether there is involvement of one, several, many or all (e.g. single subject or object or multiple subjects or objects). If it is not stated or is unclear, it is an error.

35. DEF: Indexing is used frequently in ASL. It is one way space is used to provide information to the addressee in a structured manner. One form of indexing is to use the passive hand as a base. The fingers on the passive hand are used as the location from where future information referring to that item may be located. The hand must have the accurate palm orientation, the accurate fingers used and accurate order of counting. For example, if discussing four children in the family, the passive hand can be used in a FOUR-HANDSHAPE, with the palm facing inward. The index finger tends to be the oldest child and the baby finger often refers to the youngest child. By pointing to the specific finger for that child, these four fingers can be used repeatedly, providing information pertaining to each child. The order of counting must be accurate. That is, if two topics are discussed and two fingers are used on the passive hand to refer to these two topics, the ones most often used are the index and middle fingers. If neutral space is used for indexing, the location of each item or person must be identified prior to talking about them. Then all of the following information can be expressed by pointing or indexing that location in space. Unless the speaker is redundant, a variety of indexing techniques should be used, not just one (depending on the topic, of course).

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

34. Pronominalization is accurate .....NA Y N

Errors

34.A Who is saying what to whom is inaccurate .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

34.B Who is doing what to whom is inaccurate .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

34.C When the person or thing is moving, moves a referent from place to place inaccurately .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

34.D When the speaker's perspective changes, moves a referent from place to place inaccurately .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

34.E Distinctions among the involvement of some, many or all of the people, places or things are inaccurate .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

35. Indexing techniques are accurate .....NA Y N

Errors

35.A Listing on fingers is inaccurate .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

35.B Pointing to locations is inaccurate .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

35.C One indexing system is used repeatedly .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

REMINDERS

-Be sure to refer to the work or the interpretation, not the interpreter, when writing comments. Avoid using 'you', for example, "you signed..." or "your interpretation..." Instead use "the interpretation demonstrated signs that..." or the "interpretation was..."

-Be sure to write both positive and negative comments when providing feedback about the interpretation.

-View the tape at least twice without sound.

-Be sure to rate every skill and every error.

-If the skill is not present, then it is marked NA, not applicable, and all of the errors related to this skill are also marked NA.

-Remember to rate the errors associated with the skill it defines only. The errors should not be rated as if they were associated with other skills For example, the error 5.B "rhythm or cadence is inaccurate" should be rated in association with skill 5. "Fingerspelling is used for emphasis accurately". It should not be rated for overall rhythm or cadence of the fingerspelling in the interpretation.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

GRAMMAR

Rating Key

NA	=	Not applicable, not in the target language, ASL
Y	=	Yes, the skill was performed accurately 100% of the time
N	=	No, the skill was not performed accurately 100% of the time

NA	=	Not applicable, not in the target language, ASL
O	=	No errors observed
1	=	Low frequency, low severity
2	=	High frequency, low severity
3	=	Low frequency, high severity
4	=	High frequency , high severity

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

GRAMMAR

36. DEF: Each type of structure has its own rules. Declarative sentences are one of the most common sentence structures in any language. For example, in declarative statements (Henry loves Edith), there is often a nod at the end of the sentence accompanied with a tightening of closed lips to emphasize the statement is true. Sentence structures such as commands, ordering the addressee to do something uses direct eye contact with the person being spoken to.

Because English is the source language and has different pausing patterns from ASL, problems with the clarity of the target message can occur. Instead of signing a conditional sentence with a pause between the two parts (If I go, I'll have to stop at the bank), run-on sentences can occur. This contrasts with relative clauses (My mother, who is an interpreter, likes people) where there is no pause in ASL but may have a pause in English.

Each structure should be complete and there should be a variety of sentence structures without overuse of any one particular structure (depending on the speaker, setting and content of message, of course).

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

GRAMMAR

36. Statements are signed accurately .....NA Y N

Errors

36.A Nonmanual facial grammar is inaccurate .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

36.B ASL pausing is inaccurate .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

36.C The structure is incomplete (e.g. IF ME GO-TO J-A-M-A-I-C-A...and it is not finished) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

36.D Statement sentence structures are used excessively (e.g. conditionals) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

37. DEF: There are different types of question structures in ASL, such as rhetorical questions (Why do I want to go? I love traveling), wh-questions (Where do you live?) and yes-no questions (Did you like the movie?).

Nonmanuals for these structures must be accurate. For example, wh-questions have a brow squint throughout the sentence, whereas the yes-no questions have brows raised. Without these specific nonmanual grammatical signals confusion can occur.

Rhetorical questions are used to draw attention to specific information that will be provided following the rhetorical question. This structure is not eliciting a response from the addressee. It is an error if it is used excessively because it loses its impact.

For conditional sentence structures ending in questions (If I go to the bank do I need identification?) and for rhetorical questions, pausing is important. For example, in conditionals there is a pause before the question portion of the sentence and in rhetoricals the pause is after the question. If it is not present, it is inaccurate.

38. DEF: Facial adjectives and adverbs are grammatical signals which accompany signing. They are necessary to convey accurate information about the specific meaning of the utterance. Meaning is lost without these necessary features. They assist in clarifying meaning such as large, small or average in size. They can indicate width by describing if it is wide or narrow. They can also identify the texture whether something is smooth or rough. In addition they describe how something was accomplished, for example, slowly or quickly.

Eye gaze is another grammatical signal. For example, the sign READ most often has an eye gaze to the location of the signing. Also, eye gaze can be used to show emphasis, approximations, and uncertainty.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

37. Signs questions accurately .....NA Y N

Errors

37.A Nonmanual facial grammar is inaccurate .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

37.B ASL pausing is inaccurate .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

37.C The structure is incomplete (e.g. WESLEY+LEAVE without adding WHY, thus appearing to be a yes-no question) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

37.D Question sentence structures are used excessively (e.g. rhetorical questions) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

38. Nonmanual facial grammar is accurate .....NA Y N

Errors

38.A Facial adverbs are inaccurate (e.g. "MM" and "TH") .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

38.B Facial adjectives are inaccurate (e.g. "CHA") .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

38.C Eye gaze is inaccurate .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

39. DEF: Pluralization must be made as equally clear in the interpretation as it is in the source language message. There are many ways to convey pluralization. This item is specifically addressing the articulation of signs. In order to express pluralization either a plural indicator must be signed such as FEW or MANY, or the sign itself must be altered to indicate more than one. For example, classifiers are often made plural by repeating the sign in different locations. For signs with an agent sign, only the agent sign is repeated, not the entire word such as INTERPRET-AGENT + INTERPRET-AGENT. In general, this is not accurate, except in extremely formal settings.

40. DEF: Duration (e.g. ALL-DAY), regularity (e.g. EVERY-AFTERNOON), approximate time (ABOUT-FIVE-O'CLOCK), the meaning "repeated and prolonged" (e.g. YEARS-AND-YEARS), relationship to present time (e.g. RECENTLY, FUTURE) are all ways to express the meaning of time. The meaning will be skewed if these concepts are not signed accurately. Differences such as 'afternoon' and 'all afternoon' must be clearly differentiated. This difference and others like it can be conveyed, for example by altering the sign movement to show the difference and using nonmanual facial markers to convey the accurate meaning.

Time indicators (e.g. TOMORROW, LAST-YEAR) generally appear at the beginning of an ASL utterance.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

39. Signs plurals accurately (i.e. more than one) .....NA Y N

Errors

39.A Movements are inaccurate .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

39.B Repetitions are inaccurate (e.g. no repetition of the sign thereby appearing singular) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

39.C Plural indicators are inaccurate (e.g. MANY) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

40. Time is signed accurately (e.g. EVERY-NIGHT, RECENT-PAST) ..... NA Y N

Errors

40.A Time is signed inaccurately .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

40.B Nonmanual facial grammar is inaccurate .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

40.C Time is signed in an inaccurate location in the sentence structure (e.g. at the end of the paragraph instead of the beginning) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

41. DEF: Temporal aspect (e.g. SLEEPS-UNUSUALLY-OFTEN, LAUGHS-LONG-TIME) is a way in which some signs, often verbs, are modulated to show additional meaning such as regularity and length of the occurrence. It is not specific (e.g. ten times, two hours) rather, it is general (e.g. many times, long time) in meaning. It indicates the interpretation of the speaker's perception and feeling of the meaning of the verb. Temporal aspect is associated with how something was done over time and for how long it occurred. Was it regular (e.g. GO-TO + GO-TO + SCHOOL) or infrequent? Was it done repeatedly (e.g. WORK-OVER-AND-OVER-AGAIN)? It is important to use temporal aspect instead of signing "I + GO + THERE + OFTEN". Specific nonmanual markers are often associated with temporal aspect. For example, WORK-OVER-AND-OVER-AGAIN, the nonmanual of 'STA' is often present. This facial grammar must agree with the production and meaning of the sign.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

41. Temporal aspect is accurate (e.g. regularly, for a long time) ..... NA Y N

Errors

41.A Temporal aspect is inaccurate .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

41.B Nonmanual facial grammar is inaccurate .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

INTERPRETING

Rating Key

NA	=	Not applicable, not in the target language, ASL
Y	=	Yes, the skill was performed accurately 100% of the time
N	=	No, the skill was not performed accurately 100% of the time

NA	=	Not applicable, not in the target language, ASL
O	=	No errors observed
1	=	Low frequency, low severity
2	=	High frequency, low severity
3	=	Low frequency, high severity
4	=	High frequency , high severity

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

INTERPRETING

42. DEF: The source message should be accurately expressed both linguistically and culturally to have equivalency of meaning. If any meaning is deleted or added it is inaccurate. This does not mean that a cultural adjustment is an error if it is used (e.g. substitutions, additions) to convey the meaning. If the cultural adjustments equate the meaning, without adding to or subtracting from it, then it is accurate. For example, if the speaker is talking about the annoying sound outside, the interpretation must provide information about the sound. The interpretation may include not only that there is sound, but also, what does it sound like (e.g. a hammer, someone walking or an electric egg beater).

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

INTERPRETING

42. The meaning of the source language (English) is interpreted accurately .....NA Y N

Errors

42.A Addition of meaning occurs .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

42.B Omission of meaning occurs other than numbers and fingerspelling (e.g. incomplete meaning, nuances are omitted, opposite meaning is conveyed such as omitting negation, thus making the interpretation look affirmative) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

42.C Cultural adjustments are made inaccurately .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

43. DEF: The structure of the target language should be in ASL. It should not follow English word order and should have little to no influence from English. If English influences are present, such as initialized signs (for example, REHABILITATION signed like HELP but with the letter 'R' instead of the A-handshape), this can be confusing to the addressee who may not be sure of the meaning or may have seen the same sign used to mean "resources". This skews the ASL meaning and requires the addressee to interpret the meaning. Note: Initialized signs do not include old signs such as WORLD, which is not an invented English sign developed for the purpose of teaching English to children. Older signs have been used for generations and have changed over time as any language changes (e.g. RESPONSIBLE and LANGUAGE which changed to initialized signs many years prior to the creation of English sign systems). The grammatical pauses should be those of ASL, not English. English mouthing should not be evident, if it skews the nonmanual grammatical markers.

44. DEF: It is important to match and convey the same intent as the speaker's. The intent includes expression (e.g. intensity, emphasis) and affect (e.g. mood). The interpretation should not have facial expression that is incongruent with the intent of the speaker. The facial expression accurately reflect those aspects of the speakers mood and delivery.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

43. The target language interpretation successfully avoids interference from the source language .....NA Y N

Errors

43.A The interpretation follows English structure, not ASL (e.g. word for word, sign for sign) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

43.B Initialized signs are used (e.g DEVELOP [with initialization 'D'] + MENT) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

43.C Grammatical pauses are inaccurate .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

43.D English is mouthed when it should not be present .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

43.E Nonmanual grammar is inaccurate .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

---

44. The intention of the speaker is reflected accurately .....NA Y N

Errors

44.A The affect used in the interpretation is inaccurate (e.g. does not match the mood of the speaker) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

44.B The interpretation is inaccurately monotone (e.g. lack of facial expression, intensity or stress of signing is demure) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

44.C The interpretation is inaccurately expressive (e.g. exaggerated mouthing, intensity or stress of signing is excessive) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

45. DEF: The interpretation should match the speaker's register. If the setting and the speaker's affect is formal then the interpretation should be formal. If within this formal atmosphere the speaker changes, whether for a short or long period, the interpretation should accurately reflect these register changes. English register is matched in ASL in a variety of ways. For example, large signing for formal or platform speeches, and smaller signing for more intimate one on one settings is often used. Vocabulary is also an indication of register. For example, specific name signs not known by all the addressees could be intimate register, whereas formal vocabulary, are those vocabulary items which are most likely known by all addressees and do not require an intimate knowledge of the discussion/text to understand the meaning. At times the interpretation can reflect an informal or casual register by using excessive or exaggerated body shifts, that is, what often is used for children. The interpretation should reflect the register of the speaker and should only change register when the speaker changes.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

45. The ASL register reflects the English register accurately .....NA Y N

Errors

45.A The register is inaccurately formal .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

45.B The register is inaccurately informal (e.g. KNOW signed on the cheek instead of the forehead) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

45.C The register is inaccurately intimate (e.g. using specific vocabulary the addressee is likely not to know) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

45.D Maintains the same register when the speaker changes his/her register inaccurately (e.g. from a formal lecture to a group of individuals changing to a very informal one on one discussion with a participant during a demonstration of counseling techniques) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

45.E Inaccurately changes the register when the speaker does not .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

46. DEF: There are a variety of ways to show different perspectives of an event or action. One way is the choice of classifiers and SASSes. They are used to express not only the size, shape and location of something but also they are used to convey the speaker's vantage point on the subject. For example, if a person is walking close to the water on the beach and a large wave comes up, the interpretation would look different than if someone was watching the large waves crashing on the beach from a hotel room. The focus of the action (the closing of the door or the noise the slam made when it closed) is combined with the location of the event in terms of its distance or closeness to the action or event.

47. DEF: It is natural for errors to occur while interpreting. Once errors are identified they should be repaired accurately and repaired with ease. If they are repaired with apologies (e.g. SORRY or EXCUSE ME) this would be considered an awkward repair. If information is missed or not understood, this should be reflected in the interpretation and is not considered an error within this category. Excessive repairing should be avoided. If errors are repaired excessively it means that a distraction occurs causing the viewer, in this case the rater, to focus on the repairs rather than the message itself.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

46. The interpretation of the speaker's perspective is accurate .....NA Y N

Errors

46.A Distance of the speaker's perspective from the topic or action is interpreted inaccurately (e.g. people standing at a distance and people standing near by) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

46.B The focus of the action or the event is inaccurate (e.g. discussing the knot on the tree trunk, not the entire tree) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

47. The interpreter repairs errors accurately .....NA Y N

Errors

47.A Errors are unnoticed by interpreter (i.e. not repaired) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

47.B Errors are repaired inaccurately .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

47.C Errors are repaired awkwardly (e.g. rolling the eyes in frustration) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

47.D Errors are repaired excessively (e.g. excessive false starts) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

48. DEF: If the interpretation is at a quick pace or if the pace quickens during a presentation it can affect the interpretation. The meaning of speed here not only refers to words per minute, but also speed of the delivery related to the nature of the information. The speaker can be speaking at a relatively slow pace but the information is 'fast' for the process of interpretation (e.g. technical content or reading a prepared speech). Due to fatigue, both physical and mental, the number of errors can increase in longer presentations. The number of errors may increase with a change in pace and the interpretation may resemble English structure which are both errors.

49. DEF: When an interpreter is unsure of the utterance, the interpretation should reflect this unsureness. The interpretation should not be seen as stated definitely by the speaker. There should be a clear distinction between the interpreter's and the speaker's uncertainty. For example, if the interpreter is unsure if the speaker said Terry or Gary, then this should be made clear to the addressee that it is the interpreter's uncertainty and not the speaker's.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

48. Maintains the interpretation accuracy regardless of the speaker's pace .....NA Y N

Errors

48.A Errors increase as the speaker's pace increases .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

48.B Errors increase as the speaker's pace slows down .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

48.C More errors occur at the end of the interpretation than at the beginning .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

48.D The ASL structure changes to a more English like interpretation when the speaker's pace changes .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

49. Expresses uncertainty when not understanding or unsure of the utterance appropriately .....NA Y N

Errors

49.A When the interpreter is unsure of the message, there is no quizzical expression to indicate this .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

49.B Unclear whether it is the interpreter's or speaker's uncertainty .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

50. DEF: ASL requires that referents be clear when the topic of the discussion or the sentence referred to originally is referred back to a second time. In English, as in other languages, pronouns are used to refer to something talked about earlier. In ASL these must be interpreted in relation to the message, that is, the components must be linked together in order to be consistent with the source language message. If it is not linked, the interpretation is left up to the addressee which is not his/her responsibility. If the message is linked in English it should be linked in ASL. This skill area does not mean if the English is unclear that the ASL interpretation be made clear. Unless the speaker is redundant, referring back to the topic should not be done excessively.

51. DEF: When the speaker is talking about himself and using personal pronouns such as 'I' and 'me', the interpretation should also use the ASL personal pronoun 'ME' and not 'S/HE-INDEX', pointing to the speaker. A clear distinction should be made between 'I' the speaker and 'I' the interpreter. Of course, at times, an interpreter will refer to himself or herself when speaking directly to the addressee or the speaker. This should be clear and there should be an observable difference.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

50. Refers back to the topic when a pronoun is used accurately (e.g. The stock Aldus is doing well. **It** (INDEX) should be bought immediately.) .....NA Y N

Errors

50.A Does not refer back to the topics .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

50.B Refers back to the topics excessively .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

50.C Refers back to the inaccurate topics .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

51. Interprets the speaker's comments in the first person accurately .....NA Y N

Errors

51.A Refers to speaker as INDEX-S/HE + SEE when the speaker says "I saw..." .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

51.B Distinctions between I the speaker and I the interpreter are not accurate (e.g. the interpreter wants to tell the addressee that she is having difficulty hearing the speaker) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

52. DEF: Eye contact with the addressee or the camera is imperative. One uses this eye contact to determine if the message is coming across to the deaf person by observing the addressee's facial expression such as nodding, quizzical looks or shaking of the head indicating s/he is not understanding. This eye contact also establishes the sightline with which space is used. For example, signs such as HE, SHE, and OVER THERE are all off the sightline, whereas ME and YOU are on the sightline.

53. DEF: The use of two hands in ASL is imperative. The passive hand is used in a variety of ways. For example, the passive hand can be used to indicate a chair in the corner of the house by indexing or using a classifier, while the dominant hand is showing where the person walked. Hand dominance should not change haphazardly such as FOREST or BLAME signed with the passive hand moving. Dominance should remain constant and should only change when there is a linguistic reason to do so.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

52. Eye contact is appropriate .....NA Y N

Errors

52.A Eye contact with the addressee/camera is not present (e.g. looking at floor, looking at speaker) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

52.B Eye contact with the addressee/camera is excessive (e.g. staring) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

53. Accurately uses both hands for signing (e.g. indexing on nondominant hand, indicating a spatial relationship) .....NA Y N

Errors

53.A The passive hand is not used when it could be (i.e. underused) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

53.B Changes dominance for no linguistic reason .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

54. DEF: The signing in the interpretation should be smooth and not choppy or jerky. This can cause inaccurate linguistic phrasing. The signs should flow from one to another. The signs should not be signed all together, that is, slurred. The interpretation should be confident and smooth, moving from one sign to the next with ease and without hesitation.

55. DEF: Signs should be made in a comprehensible manner. If the signing is too large (e.g. the arms are fully extended or going off the screen), then it is an error. If the signing is so small, that it is difficult to comprehend the interpretation, it is an error as well. The signing size should vary according to the setting. If it is a one on one doctor's appointment, the signing would be smaller than if interpreting to a large audience of 50 people. If there is a change in size of signing there should be a linguistic reason. It should not be the case that small signing all of a sudden has 2 or 3 large signs for no linguistic reason.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

54. The signing is controlled (e.g. smooth) .....NA Y N

Errors

54.A The flow is choppy/jerky (e.g. start and stop in linguistically inaccurate places, stuttering or repetition of signs such as HAVE) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

54.B The flow is hesitant (e.g. the interpreter appears to need time to think or is unsure how to convey the message) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

55. The size of signing is appropriate .....NA Y N

Errors

55.A The movements of the signs are too large (e.g. causing distraction, going off the television screen) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

55.B The movements of the signs are too cramped (e.g. unreadable, no distinction between two different signs) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

55.C Signing size varies between large and small for no linguistic reason .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

COMPOSURE AND APPEARANCE

Rating Key

NA	=	Not applicable, not in the target language, ASL
Y	=	Yes, the skill was performed accurately 100% of the time
N	=	No, the skill was not performed accurately 100% of the time

NA	=	Not applicable, not in the target language, ASL
O	=	No errors observed
1	=	Low frequency, low severity
2	=	High frequency, low severity
3	=	Low frequency, high severity
4	=	High frequency , high severity

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

COMPOSURE AND APPEARANCE

56. DEF: The interpretation should convey the speaker's meaning and intent and not the reactions or feelings of the interpreter. Personal interjections should not be observed in the interpretation. The interpreter's opinions should not show. Only the speaker's ideas and opinions should be conveyed. The interpreter should also maintain composure. For example, raising hands or using gestures that are not part of the speaker's message is not maintaining composure. The intent of the speaker should be conveyed, not the intent of the interpreter. The message should be interpreted prior to the interpreter giving any reactions. At times, it is appropriate to react to the message but the message, whether it is a joke or a horror story, must be interpreted prior to the interpreter's reactions. If the interpreter laughs prior to revealing the punch line of a joke, it is inaccurate. Also, when everyone else is clapping enthusiastically, it is culturally appropriate for the interpreter to clap. The interpreter should respond in a culturally appropriate manner.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

COMPOSURE AND APPEARANCE

56. The interpreter is composed while interpreting .....NA Y N

Errors

56.A Reacts to source language message prior to interpreting it (e.g. laughs at joke prior to interpreting the message) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

56.B Displays the interpreter's own emotions inappropriately (e.g. puzzlement, confusion, worry) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

56.C Reacts to his/her own errors (adding apologies for the misinterpretations for example, EXCUSE ME, SORRY) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

56.D Does not react when culturally appropriate (e.g. All are laughing but the interpreter remains neutral with no response) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

57. DEF: There should be control of personal mannerisms. If the body is tense then the shoulders might inch upward. Or if the body is too relaxed, the torso might slouch or become overly casual. When there is a pause in the interpretation, the hands should be comfortably placed in the lap or if standing, down by the sides. Clasping the hands together in front of the waist may be permissible. However, due to the large number of repetitive motion injuries (e.g. tendonitis, carpal tunnel syndrome) associated with sign language interpreting, it is healthier to have the hands in a relaxed position on the lap or by the sides rather than clasped at waist level or above when the blood can not easily flow to the finger tips.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

57. Good posture is maintained .....NA Y N

Errors

57.A The head moves down to meet the signs (e.g. FATHER) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

57.B Slouching is present .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

57.C Shoulders are raised .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

57.D The body posture is distracting (e.g. swaying, walking around, legs swinging, one hip thrust outward) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

57.E Hands remain at chest or waist level during breaks in the utterance instead of placing hands down in lap or at the sides .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

58. DEF: The interpreter should be calm and relaxed, keeping all distracting mannerisms from view. The interpretation should flow without the face reflecting internal mental processing. Behaviors such as pushing up one's glasses, or playing with facial hair such as a mustache should not be seen. Facial expressions that distract the addressee, for example, excessive frowning or twitching of any kind should not be observable.

59. DEF: The interpreter's attire can affect the interpretation. The clothes should contrast in color with the pigment of the skin and should not have shiny or flowery patterns. If jewelry is worn it should not be distracting. The hair should be neatly arranged and should not fall into the eyes, or if long, get tangled with the hands. Mustaches and beards should be neatly trimmed.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

58. The interpreter's mannerisms are appropriate .....NA Y N

Errors

58.A The addressee can perceive the internal thinking process on the interpreter's face .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

58.B The head is distracting (e.g. bobbing) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

58.C The hands are distracting (e.g. pushing up glasses, playing with hair) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

58.D Gestures are distracting (e.g. makes a mistake and raises hands in exasperation) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

58.E Facial expressions are distracting (e.g. yawning, twitching, grimacing) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

---

59. The interpreter's appearance is appropriate .....NA Y N

Errors

59.A Jewelry is distracting (e.g. earrings, watch) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

59.B Clothing is distracting (e.g. sparkling or flowery shirt, floppy sleeves) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

59.C The hair (facial hair included) is distracting .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

59.D Make-up is distracting (e.g. nail polish, lipstick, eye shadow) .....NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

REMINDERS

-Be sure to refer to the work or the interpretation, not the interpreter, when writing comments. Avoid using 'you', for example, "you signed..." or "your interpretation..." Instead use "the interpretation demonstrated signs that..." or the "interpretation was..."

-Be sure to write both positive and negative comments when providing feedback about the interpretation.

-View the tape at least twice without sound.

-Be sure to rate every skill and every error.

-If the skill is not present, then it is marked NA, not applicable, and all of the errors related to this skill are also marked NA.

-Remember to rate the errors associated with the skill it defines only. The errors should not be rated as if they were associated with other skills For example, the error 5.B "rhythm or cadence is inaccurate" should be rated in association with skill 5. "Fingerspelling is used for emphasis accurately". It should not be rated for overall rhythm or cadence of the fingerspelling in the interpretation.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

RATER'S IMPRESSIONS

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

RATER'S IMPRESSIONS

This segment is reserved for comments associated with the interpretation task. No rating per se will occur. Impressions will be documented here in the rater's own words in narrative form.

60. Is the conduct the interpreter exhibits acceptable (e.g. clearly identifys if it's the interpreter's or the speaker's mistake, culturally appropriate manner of interrupting the speaker, not using personal interjections such as LECTURE + BORING)? Why or why not? Provide several examples.

61. Does the target message reflect the source message? Why or why not? Provide several examples.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

62. Is the ASL semantic base sufficient for the interpreting task? Why or why not? Provide several examples.

63. Was the target language ASL? Why or why not? Provide several examples.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

64. Does the interpreter's own values, beliefs, or biases skew the interpretation (e.g. interpreting the word 'chairman' as CHAIRWOMAN or interpreting The Great One as JESUS when interpreting for Natives of North America)? Provide several examples.

65. Throughout the interpretation, how well is the same interpreting quality maintained from beginning to end? Provide several examples.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

66. Other comments the rater would like to make.

**Document time and date completed:_ _____

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

CROSS REFERENCE INDEX

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

TOPIC	ITEM NUMBER
Acronyms	2
Additions	42.A
Affect	44.A, 44.B, 44.C
Age appropriate	21.A
Agreeement	29.B
Appearance (see composure)	
Characterization perspective taking	30
Clarity	7, 15, 19.E
Classifiers and SASSes	22-28
Composure and appearance	56-59
Compound signs	18.C
Conduct	60
Cultural adjustments	42.C, 56.D
Deletions (see omissions)	
Distractions	58, 59
Double-handed signs	19.H, 24.D, 26.D

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

TOPIC ..... ITEM NUMBER

Emphasis 5

English
- comprehension 61
- endings 18.G
- initialized signs 18.F, 432.B
- mouthing 43.D
- sign systems 20.B
- structure 43.A, 48.D

Error repair 47

Eye gaze 5.A, 38.C, 52

Fingerspelling 1-10
- spelling 1.A

First person 51

Geography 29.D

Grammar 36-41

Handshapes 19.A, 22.A, 23.A

Incorporation
- numbers 13

Indexing 35

Intent 44

Interpreting 42-55, 63

Loan signs 18.D

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

TOPIC ..... ITEM NUMBER

Location of
numbers 12.D
signs 19.C

Mistakes
(see error repair)

Monitoring
(see self-monitoring)

Mouthing 10

Movement 8, 12.C, 15.B, 19.B, 19.F, 39.A, 39.B

Nondominant hand
(see passive hand)

Nonmanual facial
grammar 18.B, 19.G, 22.B, 23.B, 33.D, 36.A,
37.A,38, ... 40.B, 41.B, 43.E

Noun-verb pairs 18.E

Numbers 11-17
(see incorporation)
numbering systems 12
number signs
non-specific 14

Omissions 3, 11.B, 42.B

Pace 9, 16, 17
speaker's pace 48,

Palm orientation 12.B,19.D

Passive hand 32.B, 53

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

TOPIC ..... ITEM NUMBER

Pausing 36.B, 37.B, 43.C

Pictorial outlining 26

Plurals 39

Pronominalization 34

Posture 57

Questions 37

Reality principle 29.C

Redundancy 5.C, 20.C, 30.D, 35.C, 36.D, 37.D

Register 45

Rhythm 5.B, 6

SASSes
(see classifiers and SASSes)

Semantics 18.A, 62

Space
(see structruing space)

Speed
(see pace)

Spelling
(see fingerspelling)

Statements 36

Structuring space 29-35
restructuring 31.B

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

TOPIC ..... ITEM NUMBER

Temporal aspect 41

Time 40

Verbs 24.B, 33
body-anchored 33.C
directional 33.B

Visual accuracy 24

Vocabulary 18-21
Diversity 20
Regional 21.B

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

Appendix G

Rater's Instruction Manual: Draft 2

RATER'S INSTRUCTION MANUAL for TAYLOR'S DIAGNOSTIC INSTRUMENT:

English to American Sign Language Interpretation Assessment

by Marty M. Taylor

For research purposes only

June 1993

TABLE OF CONTENTS PAGE

PURPOSE AND GOALS 2
BRIEF DESCRIPTION 3
TERMINOLOGY 3
ASSUMPTIONS AND PRIOR CONDITIONS 5
LIMITATIONS 5
RATER QUALIFICATIONS 7
INTERPRETER QUALIFICATIONS 8
INSTRUMENT ORGANIZATION 8
USING AND DEVELOPING STIMULI 12
ADMINISTRATION PROCEDURES 13
Amount of Time Required to Rate Interpretations 13
Requirements Prior to Rating 14
Viewing the Video Tape 14
RATING PROCESS 15
RESULTS 21

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

PURPOSE AND GOALS

Taylor's Diagnostic Instrument is a self-instructive diagnostic instrument for interpreter educators working in the field of American Sign Language/English and who evaluate interpretations of interpreters'.

The purpose of this instrument is to diagnostically assess video taped interpretations from English to ASL. This instrument assesses neither ASL to English, nor transliteration skills.

The instrument assesses a particular interpretation an interpreter or student interpreter provides. It is a specific assessment of a specific piece of work. It measures how well the message of the interpretation matches the source language, English.

The goal of the instrument is to provide a standardized format for viewing and assessing ASL interpretations. By providing standardized diagnoses, interpreters will have an opportunity to develop their skills based on the specific criteria contained in this diagnostic instrument and the degree to which they achieved these skills.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

BRIEF DESCRIPTION

This instrument provides a standardized format to view English to ASL video taped interpretations. It organizes large numbers of skills according to Major Features.

Eight Major Features are presented in the following order:

1) Fingerspelling
2) Numbers
3) Vocabulary
4) Classifiers/SASSes (Size and Shape Specifiers)
5) Structuring Space
6) Grammar
7) Interpreting
8) Composure and Appearance

Within the Major Features a common format is used. Each listed skill is followed by a related list of possible errors along with a corresponding definition. In addition, the Major Features are followed by an overall narrative assessment, Rater's Impressions.

TERMINOLOGY

The two languages used in this instrument are English and American Sign Language (ASL). English is the source language, the

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

language first uttered, and ASL is the target language, the language into which the interpretation is made.

There are at least two consumers, one hearing and one Deaf, referred to in the instrument. The hearing consumer, speaking English, is referred to as the speaker. It is this person who initiates the source language sample, English. The Deaf consumer is the person to whom the interpretation is provided.

Persons using this assessment instrument are raters and the persons undergoing the assessment are interpreters.

The dominant hand is the active hand. The non-dominant hand is the passive or base hand. For right-handed signers these are the right and the left hand, respectively.

In the text of the manual and instrument, ASL is written in capital letters. Hyphens are used between words or between individual letters to indicate that one sign is used or that the word is fingerspelled. For example, SHAVE-ON-HEAD indicates one sign, whereas, B-A-R-B-A-R-A indicates a fingerspelled word. If more than one sign is used then plus symbols are written between each different sign. For example, MOM + GO + HOME, indicates three separate signs.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

ASSUMPTIONS AND PRIOR CONDITIONS

The basic assumptions and prior conditions are:

-The rater is qualified and has the knowledge and ability to assess the interpretation accurately.

-The rater must have access to both the English message and ASL interpretation to evaluate the work, especially to evaluate the message equivalency.

-The text, the amount of preparation, prior knowledge of the particular stimulus, and the amount of related experience the interpreter has, will all affect the accuracy of the interpretation.

-Accurate and appropriate skills, and errors, can be observed within the same sample of work.

-When the interpretation does not match the source message, errors are present.

-Errors skew the speaker's message.

LIMITATIONS

This instrument diagnostically assesses interpretations from English to ASL. It does not apply to transliteration, and therefore,

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

should never be used to assess transliterating skills or other sign systems used to represent English.

Although this instrument assesses language, it only assesses it through the act of interpreting. It has not been developed for American Sign Language assessments and should not be used prior to interpreting education.

The instrument is manageable, but it is not exhaustive. The skills and possible errors included in the instrument represent the key requirements for an effective interpretation as validated by a national panel review and two field studies involving experts from Canada and the United States.

Due to the specific nature of the instrument and the need to provide the interpreter with a sample of his/her work with the diagnostic assessment, the interpretation must be on video tape. It is not designed to assess live interpretation performances.

Depending on the rater's background and ability to detect errors, there may be false positives (i.e. an error occurs in the interpretation, but the rater overlooks the error and marks it accurate instead of inaccurate). The rater must have a keen eye for detecting errors. Without this perspective and awareness, an error may go unnoticed and marked inaccurately.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

RATER QUALIFICATIONS

People using this instrument, raters, will be interpreter educators with a minimum of two years experience evaluating interpreters either on the job (e.g. practicum supervisors or lead interpreters) or teaching interpretation skills to students. Experience teaching professionalism or other theory-based courses is not sufficient background to use this instrument. Educators must be well-versed in ASL grammar and semantics, as well as interpretation processes.

The field is rapidly changing. Therefore, educators must be active interpreters and members of the national interpreter's organization, that is, either the Association of Visual Language Interpreters of Canada (AVLIC) or the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID). In addition, educators must be active members of the Canadian Association for the Education of Sign Language Interpreters (CAESLI) in Canada or the Conference of Interpreter Trainers (CIT) in the United States. Educators must hold national certification, either the Certificate of Interpretation offered by AVLIC in Canada or the Certificate of Interpretation or the Comprehensive Skills Certificate offered by RID in the United States.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

INTERPRETER QUALIFICATIONS

Interpreters undergoing the assessment must be either interpreting students who have mastered at least some interpreting skills or interpreters with experience in the field of English/ASL interpretation. Students who have learned ASL only and have not learned interpreting are not to be assessed using this instrument. The interpreters must have at least minimal competencies through direct training and/or work experience to be assessed using this diagnostic instrument.

INSTRUMENT ORGANIZATION

The eight Major Features are sequenced in the following order: Fingerspelling, Numbers, Vocabulary, Classifiers and Size and Shape Specifiers, Structuring Space, Grammar, Interpretation, and Composure and Appearance. The sequence is designed to move the rater through the categories with ease. As determined by a panel of experts, each Major Feature includes a list of skills, sequenced from most essential to least essential followed by a list of possible errors related to each skill. All of the skills and errors are numbered consecutively from the beginning to the end of the instrument; they are not numbered by feature. Following each list of

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

possible errors is a series of blank lines for writing comments, and providing feedback and examples to help clarify the meaning of the rating the rater gives the interpretation. An example is provided in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Example of skill #47 with related errors from the Major Feature of Interpreting.

47. The interpreter repairs errors accurately ..... NA Y N

Errors

47.A Errors are unnoticed by interpreter (i.e. not repaired) ..... NA 0 1 2 3 4

47.B Errors are repaired inaccurately ..... NA 0 1 2 3 4

47.C Errors are repaired awkwardly (e.g. rolling the eyes in frustration) ..... NA 0 1 2 3 4

47.D Errors are repaired excessively (e.g. excessive false starts) ..... NA 0 1 2 3 4

Corresponding to each skill, on the opposite page from the skill, are definitions. An example is provided in Figure 2. The definitions accompanying each skill are intended for general, not

specific, applications. There are a multitude of exceptions and not all of them are included in this instrument. For example, it is generally accepted that the number of false starts should not be excessive. However, if this accurately reflects the speaker's message; that is, if the speaker has an excessive number of false starts, then the interpretations of false starts are appropriate and are not considered errors.

Figure 2: Definition #47 corresponding to skill #47 within the Major Feature of Interpretation

47. DEF: It is natural for errors to occur while interpreting. Once errors are identified they should be repaired accurately and repaired with ease. If they are repaired with apologies (e.g. SORRY or EXCUSE ME) this would be considered an awkward repair. If information is missed or not understood, this should be reflected in the interpretation and is not considered an error within this category. Excessive repairing should be avoided. If errors are repaired excessively it means that a distraction occurs causing the viewer, in this case the rater, to focus on the repairs rather than the message itself.

The final section of the instrument to be completed is the Rater's Impressions which gives the rater a place to write general comments and impressions. This is formatted slightly differently from the rest of the instrument. It is constructed with questions the rater answers in narrative form. No lists of skills or possible

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

errors are present. It is simply a place for the rater to write comments that are not addressed earlier or that the rater wants to make explicit in the feedback to the interpreter. Figure 3 provides an example.

Figure 3: Example from Rater's Impressions: #64

64. Does the interpreter's own values, beliefs, or biases skew the interpretation (e.g. interpreting the word 'chairman' as CHAIRWOMAN or interpreting The Great One as JESUS when interpreting for Natives of North America)? Provide several examples.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Overlap occurs throughout the instrument. Several skills, such as nonmanual facial grammar, occur in more than one skill area. Overlap allows cross-referencing of skills across Major Features.

At the back of the instrument, the Cross Reference Index lists where a particular skill appears in the instrument. This reference section addresses the possibility that a skill or error may occur in more than one location. It can be used as a cross reference to assist in rating the interpretation.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

USING AND DEVELOPING STIMULI

The instrument can be used with a variety of English source language texts. One five-minute audio tape accompanied with a written transcript is provided with the instrument.

If the rater chooses to develop materials, the English source language tape should include texts that will allow the interpreter an opportunity to demonstrate skills from all of the Major Features, particularly the following:

- Fingerspelling
- Numbers
- Classifiers and Size and Shape Specifiers
- Structuring Space

The remaining four Major Features will automatically arise in any English source language text.

- Vocabulary
- Grammar
- Interpreting
- Composure and Appearance

The equipment used for video taping the interpretation sample should be of excellent quality and able to pick up both the visual and auditory information necessary for rating the interpretation. The camera should have a tight focus on the interpreter, capturing the top of the head and the torso. There may be deviations from this, for

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

example, the interpreter is particularly interested in distracting mannerisms such as extraneous body movements below the waist (e.g. legs shaking). Otherwise, there should be no need to include the entire body on the screen.

ADMINISTRATION PROCEDURES

Amount of Time Required to Rate Interpretations

It will be necessary to spend about 1 to 1.5 hours to become familiar with the instrument and approximately 2 hours to mark a five minute interpretation sample.

First time users should carefully read the manual and instrument prior to using it. In this way, the rater will become familiar with it, thereby allowing more time for the actual rating of the interpretation rather than spending time understanding how to use the instrument. Once the rater is familiar with the instrument, the manual can be used for reference. Other than to refresh the memory, there is no need to read the manual every time an interpretation sample is rated.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

Requirements Prior to Rating

The assessment is conducted while viewing a video taped sample of interpretation. The television monitor screen should be at least 19" in diameter. Anything smaller reduces the visibility of the interpretation and may skew the reliability of the assessment.

The rating is based on the knowledge the rater has about the Deaf consumer and the setting. The rater should know pertinent information about the Deaf consumer such as the preferred signing style, age, and the region he/she is from. The rater should also know the setting where the interpretation occurs, for example, whether it is a formal or informal lecture provided to a large audience or it is an intimate one to one session with a counselor.

Viewing the Video Tape

First the rater should preview the video tape from beginning to end. He/she should check to be sure both the English stimulus and ASL interpretation have been recorded. Interference from the source language, English, may cause rating errors if sound is heard simultaneously while analyzing the ASL interpretation. Therefore, the rater should view the entire interpretation without sound at least twice during the assessment procedures.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

The video tape must be reviewed several times to obtain an accurate assessment of the interpretation. The sample of work may be viewed as many times as necessary. The number of times a rater views the selected tape depends on the rater's experience with the instrument and stimulus. The rating will be as accurate and informative as the rater's ability to notice errors and to reflect these back to the interpreter. As stated earlier the time required to mark a five minute sample is approximately 2 hours.

When viewing the tape, the rater should try to avoid looking at the same material repeatedly. That is, assess the entire sample, not just one segment of the work. Raters may prefer to rewind at certain sections rather than watch the entire text repeatedly from beginning to end. This is acceptable as long as the entire interpretation is evaluated and certain sections are not viewed more frequently than others.

RATING PROCESS

Because the sequence of the Major Features is specifically designed to assist the rater in moving easily from one section to the next, it is easier to follow the sequence of the instrument when rating an interpretation than to move haphazardly from one section

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

to another. However, at times a rater may wish to make a comment but is not sure where it best fits. At these times it may be helpful to use a blank piece of paper for notes; when the appropriate section is reached use the notes to complete the rating. If it is more convenient, the Cross Reference Index at the end can be used as well to locate specific skills where a comment might best fit.

Two parts of the interpretation are rated. The first is the skills themselves. The second is the possible errors associated with each skill. An example is provided in Figure 1.

Each skill is followed by three possible rating options:

NA = Not applicable, not in the target language, ASL

Y = Yes, the skill was performed accurately 100% of the time

N = No, the skill was not performed accurately 100% of the time

Each possible error is followed by five possible rating options:

NA = Not applicable, not in the target language, ASL

0 = No errors observed

1 = Low frequency, low severity

2 = High frequency, low severity

3 = Low frequency, high severity

4 = High frequency, high severity

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

The rating of 0-4 for each error is based on both the frequency and the severity of the error.

Frequency refers to the number of times an error occurs within the interpretation. It is either rated low or high in frequency. 'Low' means it occurs seldom or occasionally, once or twice among several opportunities. 'High' in frequency means it occurs repeatedly or often. Frequency can differ, in that the same error occurs across items or the same error occurs often; either way it is occurring repeatedly. An example of errors occurring across items is misspelling different words in several parts of the interpretation. An example of an error occurring repeatedly is Nazi misspelled as N-A-T-Z-I over and over again.

Severity refers to inaccuracy and the potential for misunderstanding. If it is an error, it is inaccurate. If this error does not skew the meaning, it is considered low in severity. If the error skews the meaning and the message is irretrievable or the meaning greatly altered, then it is high in severity. Severity is more serious than frequency. If the error is high in severity, the rating is either a 3 or 4, depending on the frequency.

Examples of rating errors associated with skill #47:

#47.A Errors are unnoticed by interpreter (i.e. not repaired)..... NA 0 1 2 3 4

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

NA = It was not applicable because no interpretation errors occurred. Therefore, there was no need to repair errors.

0 = Any time an error occurred the interpreter at least attempted to repair it. The errors never went unnoticed.

1 = A few interpretation mistakes were unnoticed (e.g. Signs which tend to be two handed signs in a formal situation, such as HAVE, were signed with only one hand, occasionally); the frequency was low, and the severity was low because the meaning was not skewed.

2 = Many interpretation mistakes were unnoticed, but did not skew the meaning (e.g. Signs which tend to be two handed signs in a formal situation, such as HAVE, were signed with only one hand, consistently); the frequency was high because it occurred often, and the severity was low because the meaning was not skewed.

3 = A few interpretation mistakes were unnoticed (e.g. inaccurate numbers were used occasionally); the frequency was low, but the severity was high because the meaning was skewed.

4 = Many interpretation mistakes were unnoticed (e.g. names or dates were often inaccurate); the frequency was high because it occurred repeatedly, and the severity was high because the meaning was skewed.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

If the skill is marked NA, not applicable, then all possible errors for that specific skill, are also marked NA. Meaning, if the skill was not demonstrated then all related errors were also not demonstrated and therefore NA, not applicable, is the correct rating option.

If the skill is marked Y for yes, the skill was performed accurately 100% of the time, then all possible errors for that specific skill, are either NA or O. For example, if the interpretation accurately incorporated numbers, the skill would be marked Y for yes. The possible errors associated with this skill can be either NA or O. If there was no use of number incorporation related to money then the rating is NA, because it is not applicable; it is not in the target language. However, if it was in the target language then it is marked 0, no errors observed.

If the skill is marked N for no, the skill was not performed accurately 100% of the time, the rater determines the error or errors present and scores them accordingly. The rating for the errors may differ from one another. For example, 47.A= NA; 47.B = 2; 47.C = 0; 47.D = 4.

The rater should not choose a point between those provided. For example, if the rater feels the error is between 3 and 4, the rater must choose either 3 or 4 and not circle both or indicate a midpoint like 3.5. As a general rule, if the rater feels the error is between two certain points on the continuum, the rater should

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

choose the higher number, that is, the worse error. It should be very clear to both the rater and interpreter that the scores marked are for providing insightful feedback to the applicant. A consistent rating pattern, between raters and within the same rater when rating different interpretations, will occur if the rater chooses the higher number when in doubt.

When strengths and weaknesses are noticed, these should be documented on the blank lines provided after each skill and list of possible errors. A few comments are ample to illustrate strengths or areas in need of improvement. The rater should be certain to document both the positive and the negative comments, not just negative. The rater should also use the blank lines to link skills that occur across different areas. For example, mentioning a common thread in the interpretation such as deleting information, would be useful to the interpreter.

The comments written in the instrument will be used as one part of the final assessment of the interpretation. The rater must keep in mind the clarity of the comments so when the interpreter receives the instrument, the comments make clear the strengths and weaknesses observed in the interpretation.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor

RESULTS

Once the interpreter provides an interpretation sample, no more than one month should pass before the diagnostic assessment is returned to the interpreter. Ideally, the feedback should be returned within a week of when the rater receives the sample of work. The completed diagnostic assessment instrument should be given to the interpreter along with his/her video taped interpretation sample. The rater should be available, either by phone or in person, to answer questions the interpreter might have about the diagnostic assessment.

Since this is a diagnostic, there is no pass or fail per se. The rater should be honest about the biases and skills he/she possesses and should emphasize that this is an assessment on one piece of work.

As well, the rater must provide the interpreter, based on the results of the assessment, with a suggested plan of study. This plan should include a brief summation of the strengths and weaknesses noted in the interpretation and suggested resources and activities the interpreter can utilize and undertake to further develop his/her skills.

Do not copy For research purposes only © M. Taylor